
Y0-AIX-137

EWALD'S

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

VOL. VI.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

THE

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

BY

HEINRICH EWALD,

Late Professor of the University of Göttingen.

VOL. VI.

The Life and Times of Christ.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY

J. FREDERICK SMITH.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
1883.

All rights reserved

220.95
EW1
V.6

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THIS volume is the first of the three which Ewald devotes to the third and final epoch of the History of Israel. His general idea of the purpose and the course of the history of the 'nation of the true religion' necessarily led him to include within the scope of his work the History of the Rise of Christianity, as the true end and consummation of the two thousand years of national life under a divine training without a parallel. Without Christ and his Church, he would have regarded Israel and its strange sad career as an enigma and a failure; but with Christ and his Community of the Perfected True Religion, he traced divine purpose and necessity beneath the defects, disasters, and ruin of the nation, as well as in its matchless endowments and unapproached attainments. In the first volume of the three occupied with this closing portion of the history, he writes the history of the coming and rise of the Messiah, of his work on the earth, and of his death, leading to his eternal triumph. This is the volume here translated, and entitled by the Author, *Geschichte Christus und seine Zeit.* The second volume of the three sketches the history of the growth of the Church of Christ, in the midst of the Judean and the heathen world, and the establishment of the Religion of Christ, the divine outcome of Israel's national career, in the world. This volume is entitled by the Author *Geschichte des Apostolischen Zeitalters bis zur Zerstörung Jerusalem's.*

19266
296
EW14h
v.6

The third volume of this section, and the last of the entire work, traces the history of the new and undying Community of the perfected Religion and of the old and perishing Community of Judeanism some seventy years further, until the latter finally suffered all but extinction in 'the War of Annihilation' to which the rising of Barcocheba conducted. This final volume bears the title *Geschichte der Ausgänge des Volkes Israel und des nachapostolischen Zeitalters*, the *Ausgänge* of the great Drama of the national history of two thousand years being described as, on the one hand, the entrance of Christianity into undying life and influence, and, on the other, the departure of Judeanism into decay and ruin. The Publishers have determined to complete the translation of the entire work, and this volume will be shortly followed by the next, dealing with the Apostolic Age, which is in the hands of the same Translator.

In the translation of this volume the precedent of the Translators of the previous volumes with regard to the orthography of the proper names has been followed. References to this History, and other works of the Author, have been adapted to the English translations of the same works when they exist. In the case of vols. vi. and vii. of this History (which will be vii. and viii. of the English edition), the references are to the original, which is indicated by the addition '[German],' as in previous volumes of this Translation.

With regard to an untranslated work of the Author's, to which very frequent reference is made in this volume, it is needful to offer a word of explanation. The work quoted as *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, vol. i. 2nd ed., consists of an elaborate introduction to the Synoptical Gospels, *On the Origin and Nature of the Gospels*, and of a chrono-

logical and synoptic arrangement of these Gospels, together with a commentary on the parallel texts. The introduction was first published in the Author's *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, vols. i. iii., v., vi., and in the original of the present volume the references to it are always to the *Jahrbücher*. The first edition of the work on *Die drei ersten Evangelien* contained the commentary on the Synoptists, but not this introduction. In the second edition, published in 1871, four years later than the third and last edition of this volume, the articles forming the introduction to the Gospels were placed before the commentary, and in the present translation the references to them as republished there have been added. As, however, the work has not been translated, and will hardly be in the hands of even all who could consult the original, it may be well to supply here the list of the documents which Ewald finds worked up into the present Synoptic Gospels, and to which he occasionally refers by name in this volume.

The Earliest Gospel.
The Collected Sayings [τὰ λόγια of Papias].
The same work re-edited.
(*a*) Mark's Gospel.
(*b*) The same work re-edited with the use of 1 and 2.
The Book of Higher History.
The present Gospel of Matthew.
A sixth work.
A seventh work.
An eighth work.
The Gospel of Luke.
Mark *b* in its final shape.

The Translator has occasionally added a short note of his own, either quoting a reference of the Author's, which readers without a German library at hand may be glad to have supplied, or mentioning a geographical fact which has

been brought to light since 1867. But in all such cases the addition has been enclosed within square brackets, or marked by the sign 'Tr.' An Index has also been appended, as in the case of the previous volumes. It may also be proper to remark, that occasionally when a sentence or passage has appeared decidedly obscure, the liberty has been taken to endeavour to fix its meaning by the aid of the Author's commentaries on the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel.

JENA: *February*, 1883.

CONTENTS

OF

THE SIXTH VOLUME.

BOOK VI.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CHRIST.

PAGE

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE v

INTRODUCTION: THE CONTACT OF ISRAEL WITH THE DIRECT ROMAN RULE IN PALESTINE (THE THIRD AND LAST ADVANCE OF THE FINAL PHASE OF THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE NATION).

1. General View of the Situation and the Time 1
2. The School of Hillel and its Opponents 9

First of the Three Final Stages of the History.

THE FIRST THIRTY YEARS OF THE ROMAN RULE IN PALESTINE, FROM 7 TO 37 A.D.

1. The Romans in Jerusalem and Samaria.—The Census and the Publicans.—Judas the Gaulonite.—The *Assumptio Mosis*.—The Roman Governors: Pontius Pilate 36
2. The Administrations of the Herods.—The Herodians . . 71
3. The Members of the Ancient Nation in Heathen Countries.—The Condition of the Nation in its own Sacred Land . . . 81

THE PREVIOUS CONDITIONS OF THE GERMINATION OF THE SEED OF THE CONSUMMATION.

1. The First Condition: the Conscious Need of the True Consummation 94
2. The Second Condition: the Highest Form of the Messianic Hope 103
3. The Third Condition: the Return to the Prophetic Element . 121

The Realisation of the Christian (or Messianic) Hope and the Motive for it 129

THE GROWING GERM OF THE CONSUMMATION.

a. The Sources of this History 136
b. The Chronology of this History 149
c. The Stages of this History of Christ 158

PAGE

First Elevation.—The Elevation to be the Messiah (Christ):
The Baptist.

1. The Fundamental Thought of the Baptist . . . 160
2. The working out of the Thought: Baptism . . . 167
3. The Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth 172
   a. Their Meeting 172
   b. The previous History of Jesus 178
   c. The Baptism of Jesus 191
   The End of the Baptist 196

Second Elevation.—Jesus as Christ.

A. His General Position as to

(1.) His Fundamental Thought 200
(2.) His Labours 210
(3.) His Glance into all Times 233

B. His Work on Earth.

I. Previous to the Baptist's Imprisonment.

The Commencement of his Messianic Career 242
1. The First Calls for his Messianic Exertion:—
   a. In Insight and Word 244
   b. In Working and Helping 249
2. His First Public Appearance and Labours, and the beginning of his acknowledgment in Wider Circles 252
3. The successful Return to Galilee and his new Messianic Position 267
   The Story of His Temptations 270

II. Until His Choice of the Twelve and the approaching Death of the Baptist.

The Founding of the Messianic Kingdom 272
1. His Daily Occupation 278
2. The Journey to Jerusalem this Year 281
3. The Opposition and Hostility of the World . . . 284
   The New Attitude of the Messiah to the World . . . 293
   The Founding of the Christian Community . . . 296

III. Until the Last Journey to Jerusalem 306
1. His Higher Instruction regarding the Kingdom of God and his Community on Earth 307
   The Relation of the Lord of the New Community to Spirits and Men 312
2. The Practical Training of the Twelve:—
   (a) By Trial Journeys with them 315
   (b) By their Independent Missions 324
   The Doubt of the Baptist and his End . . . 327
   (c) The Return of the Twelve and their renewed Practical Training 333
3. The increasing and more extended Journeys with the Twelve 343
   (1) The Distant Journeyings in the North . . . 347
   (2) The Autumn Stay in Jerusalem 357
   (3) The Stay by the Jordan, on both sides of it.—The Resolution of the Sanhedrin regarding Christ . 367

PAGE

THIRD ELEVATION.—CHRIST'S EARTHLY DESTRUCTION AND IMMORTAL GLORY.

His Resolution in view of the Time and his own Past Career . . 376

1. The last Journey to Jerusalem 384
The Entry into Jerusalem 392
His last Public Labours there 396
The Betrayal.—His Outward End and his Eternal Hope; the Earthly Separation and His Eternal Presence . . 405
2. His Arrest and its Consequences 421
His Trial 429
His Crucifixion and Burial 437
3. His Eternal Glory 448

INDEX 457

Translator's Addenda and Corrigenda.

Page 62, note, distribute the strokes of abbreviation above the initials of the Tract *'Aboda sara* thus—ע"ז.

Page 69, note 1, line 2, read Tetrarchs, Herod, who, &c.

Page 145, note 1. The fragment referred to is probably that from the *Codex Reginæ Suetiæ*, of the ninth century, quoted and criticised by Hase in his *Geschichte Jesu*, 1876, p. 35, which Aberle produced in the *Tübingen Quartalschrift*, 1864, no. 1, as a direct testimony from Papias, of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

Page 179. The German word *Werkmeister* has been rendered by *carpenter*. Probably this more specific term represents Ewald's real interpretation of the more general Greek word τέκτων (Matt. xiii. 55); but by the use of the German word *Werkmeister* he avoided fixing precisely the special character of Joseph's art and craft. In the Old Testament he translates the analogous Hebrew word חָרָשׁ by *Werkmeister* ('Isa.' xl. 19) and *Künstler* (Hos. viii. 6). Our word *artificer* fairly represents *Werkmeister*, though in both cases *carpenter* is most likely meant. On the question of Joseph's occupation, see Winer's *Realwörterbuch*, Part I. p. 567, and p. 607, note 5.

Note to p. 435, on the Palaces of the Herods in Jerusalem.—In the next volume of this work, on the Apostolic Age, the Author comes to deal more minutely with the topography of Jerusalem, in connection with the siege, and modifies the views expressed in this and the preceding volumes regarding the Palaces of Herod and their locality in Jerusalem. Vol. v. p. 435 (iv. p. 567 of the German), he had treated Herod's Palace in the Upper City as built upon the same site as the Palace of the Asmoneans; and in this volume, pp. 39 and 435 (vol. v. pp. 53 and 569 of the German), he supposes that when the Herods came to Jerusalem they resided in a part of the Prætorium or Herod's Palace in the Upper City; and again, p. 440 (576), he speaks of the Prætorium, or the Palace of Herod, as a good deal to the east of the city (*Ziemlich weit östlich in der Stadt*), which seems to imply that its site is regarded as identical with that of the Palace of the Asmoneans. In the volume on the Apostolic Age, pp. 638 and 769 sq., he expressly states that the Palace of the Asmoneans and that of Herod were distinct, and intimates that the reference in the present volume to the residence of the Herods when in Jerusalem, p. 435, must be corrected accordingly, which implies that it was rather in the Palace of the Asmoneans than in a wing of the Palace of Herod, or the Prætorium. In the next volume, pp. 769 sq., he fixes the site of Herod's Palace south of the three towers Hippicus, Phasael, and Mariamne, which again involves a modification of the descriptions given in vol. v. p. 435 (iv. p. 567), and in this volume p. 440.

HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

BOOK VI.

CHRIST AND HIS TIME.

INTRODUCTION.

THE CONTACT OF ISRAEL WITH THE DIRECT ROMAN RULE IN PALESTINE.

The Third and Last Advance of the Final Phase of the General History of the People of Israel.

1. *General View of the Situation and Time.*

It is true that after Herod's death, and still more after the short vassal-rule of his eldest son Archelaus over Jerusalem and Samaria, a great part of the ancient nation generally, as it continued to dwell thickly crowded together in Palestine, and a part deserving of consideration as regards rank and wealth, was for the moment glad to be placed immediately under the Roman rule. To the arbitrary rule of the Herods, who were notwithstanding always at the beck of Rome, this direct dependence on a distant government seemed preferable; and for these Roman times it seemed necessary either wholly to let go, or in any case to postpone to a distant and uncertain future, the hope of the continuance and prosperity of a national reigning family which should be in accord with the native Sacred Law. Moreover, it must be remembered that in those days Augustus had long reigned over many distant countries in most prosperous peace; his own and his family's power appeared to promise a long tranquil future; and those countries which were directly dependent on it were seen not to be less

20

flourishing, but in many respects far more so, than those which were still ruled over by vassal princes.

It is true that at that time the Roman rule in its direct form extended only over Jerusalem and Samaria with their surrounding territory, both of which, after the expulsion of Archelaus, remained almost without interruption under it. The other provinces remained for the time under the Roman vassals. But precisely at this time everything depended on the attitude of Jerusalem particularly, and the other provinces likewise submitted pretty soon to the same fate. The fate, too, of Judeans and Samaritans who were living elsewhere, dispersed through the Roman empire, depended, on many main points, on that of the two capitals, particularly of Jerusalem. Numerous as were the small inequalities which the secular position of all the members of the ancient community of the true religion thus temporarily involved, they all completely disappear in presence of the absolute power of Rome as it then prevailed.

But thus two nationalities and powers which could not be more unlike as regards inward and outward strength came into immediate contact, and were compelled to exert a friction upon each other which would be the more dangerous in proportion as the contact involved each other's characteristic peculiarities. Both claimed nothing less than a universal rule over the nations of the earth, although each in a very different way; and each claimed it with an earnestness and an unyielding decision such as has not been seen before in the history of the world. The pride of victory and desire to rule the whole world which characterised the Romans had then been scarcely at all weakened, and were also openly manifested without any consideration whenever decisive action seemed necessary or advantageous. But although they at one time cherished the most anxious fear of their own gods, and subsequently either added the gods of all the nations which they had conquered, or were about to conquer, to their own, lest they should be compelled to fear them as hostile, or else tolerated them and allowed the worship of them to be continued, they nevertheless remained, precisely as a ruling nation, without any inclination towards an independent and deeper examination of things and a purer religion. They were simply devoted to the arts of war and the government of nations, and cultivated external legalism simply in order by it also to maintain amongst so many nations the summit of life and government. The claim to universal empire which was able to stir a Judean heart to its very centre had at that time, after the painful destruction of the hopes which

gathered around the Maccabees, been greatly thrown into the background and sadly beaten down. As it then continued to exist, it rested simply upon an inspiring memory from early times, upon a dim feeling of being destined for something better; indeed, of having been chosen by God for a high vocation of a unique kind amongst the nations of the earth, and upon a hope for the future, generally no less dim. But this fire, which was at that time so greatly suppressed, might, as in so many earlier periods, easily break out again with overpowering force under the solicitation of this wholly new age. And the individual Israelite was in this matter, which stirred his heart most profoundly, always conscious of his own existence simply as a member of a great, ancient, sacred and unique nation. For there were also a few peaks and summits on which this nation was able to prevent any easy intrusion on the part of even a Roman world-power; because exceedingly weak, divided, and helpless as the nation then was, it had at the same time attained a firm and definite national development. Moreover, the ultimate logical consequences of the claims, demands, and endeavours which were possible in this case, must call forth the strong hand of Rome precisely by virtue of their extreme development.

As a fact, a collision was here prepared for of such weighty significance as had never before been met with in Israel. As the people of the true God, Israel had contended often after the time of Moses with related and neighbouring nations; but it was able, difficult as it was found to be, during the period of its youthful vigour, to overcome them all successively and to render them harmless. Afterwards, when David and Solomon's illustrious times had passed by, and it felt somewhat the effects of age, so that it did not faithfully enough guard its best treasures, it contended variously and severely with the most dissimilar powerful and distant nations. If it was for a time conquered by them and seriously injured, it always obtained fresh victories again, though they might be but of its independence as the nation of the true God in the ancient sacred land. For all these great heathen nations, however powerful they might have been for a short time, had, after all, not been sufficiently intelligent and tenacious in the art of governing dissimilar conquered nations. So that the better elements which existed in Israel, as the hidden germ of an unending development, while they sought more perfect forms, found again and again favourable moments to collect themselves anew in the conflict, and to add to their growth. But precisely

these invincible, undying elements in Israel, which constantly form again and again the axis upon which all the decisive epochs of its history revolve, had for above the last five hundred years constantly afresh sought union and more decided development in a people which had been rejuvenated amid all its vicissitudes, straits, victories, and humiliation. And at last, as the fruit of such marvellously persistent endeavour, in the last instance of the Maccabean and Herodian times also, a people had arisen which boasted, not without reason, of its well-tested faithfulness in the true religion, and of its endless conflicts for the existence and perfection of a Kingdom of the true God amongst men, and which could in its Messianic hope already embrace the whole future of the human race. But though this more perfect and spiritual conception of the true religion, which had been gradually attained to during the last five centuries, had found the place of its operation in the imperfect and dubious form of the Hagiocracy, that imperfect form itself had after all been so necessarily and so firmly developed simply because that perfection, which was the logical outcome because it was the one true goal of this whole history of two thousand years, continued to delay its appearance. It was that perfection, strictly speaking, to procure the true and proper coming of which, again, was destined to constitute the profoundest and most trying task of the future, and the necessity of the coming of which was the strictly logical consequence of the growing perception of the defects of the Hagiocracy itself. But whether this perfection should at last appear, or the imperfect Hagiocracy only be longer perpetuated, the claim to universal empire was latently involved in both; and the Hagiocracy had not so poorly educated its children that they could wholly forget the duties of a true religion or the ultimate destination of Israel.

Thus the people of true religion and buoyant eternal hope was obliged, precisely at this time when all that had hitherto been potential in it had been developed to the highest possible degree, and when everything tended forcibly to its ultimate consummation, to come into direct collision, as a subject and absolutely obedient people, with that nation which had governed with a severity which down to that time no other nation had equalled, and which possessed the most crushing material force, though, on the other hand, it had no spiritual sympathy with Israel whatever. The nation which had long been greatly weakened as regards material power, greatly divided and broken into fragments, was necessitated to encounter the most powerful

and proudest of all nations; precisely that nation in which, after all, the one important and essential thing was a mind obedient to God and a tender heart, must come into collision with that one which was of all nations the most ambitious of dominion and the most devoid of feeling. This collision approaches in point of its terrible severity that which formerly occurred between Egypt and Israel in the first days of the community of the true God, and from which this community itself originated. But it also surpasses the earlier one in the most unexpected and sublime manner; inasmuch as, on the one hand, in Israel the religious development which was commenced in those early days now rapidly approached its highest summit, while, on the other hand, in the Romans the imperial, despotic power of antiquity generally in the Western world as far as it was then known, had completely incorporated itself. Accordingly, the two extreme marked culminations of the whole culture of the ancient world came into a conflict with each other with an unavoidableness and violence such as had never before been witnessed. It must also, precisely at the end of the long history, become exceedingly fruitful in consequences, that now again this collision, like that with Egypt in the early times, did not take place between two merely neighbouring nations, but between two nations which were firmly held together as parts of the same empire. In such conflicts the one nation must either be completely disintegrated and lose itself in the other, thus altogether disappearing, or it must save itself from this total ruin by a new movement of its profoundest energies and the treasures of soul which may perhaps still lie latent within it. Moreover, the Roman empire was at this time incomparably more extensive, more firmly knit together and tenacious than the Egyptian empire in those primitive times, so that the final result also of a deadly collision of this kind could become incomparably greater.

It need hardly be said that the Romans had at first no true idea, indeed, scarcely an inkling, of the combination of most important matters and most decisive issues which was involved in this collision. Their conduct, after they had determined to set up a direct government in Palestine, around the rocky eminence of Jerusalem, had been prescribed for them by their previous attitude, and necessarily took a very simple form. When Augustus resolved to assume directly the government of the provinces of Archelaus, he undoubtedly supposed that he should at the same time lighten the anxieties which this land, that had always been so restless under the Herods, had hitherto

caused him. He hoped to reduce this perpetually dissatisfied and singular nation into the condition to which so many other enfeebled or despairing nations had already fallen under the Roman sceptre. He had a faculty for regular and, as far as Rome's interests allowed, equitable government, and also for peaceable government wherever that was possible. To crush every manifestation of discontent and every dangerous movement of the people in the bud must become the one prime principle of such a government, and it was simply prudence which could recommend consideration and exceptional kindness.

Neither in Israel, doubtless, were there at first many who cast a clear glance into a future of this kind as it was now about to dawn. The majority of those who cared for peace, quiet enjoyment of wealth and luxury, had themselves, in fact, desired the immediate rule of Rome as the best thing for the present. Had not, indeed, Cæsar and Augustus[1] already granted many gratefully valued advantages to members of the nation who were living dispersed through the Roman empire? Such persons as these were for the present happy to be independent of the Herodian rule, and thought but little about the more distant future. However, the consequences of the new contact of the immediate Roman rule and of the thought and endeavour of all the various divisions into which the ancient nation of Israel had now fallen, manifested themselves rapidly. There had long existed, even in every smaller section of the nation, e.g. in Jerusalem and its surrounding district, representatives of the most various spiritual endeavours, and such as were very indifferent to the outward possessions of life and the quiet enjoyment of them, and who felt an obligation to gain and defend by every effort higher blessings than these. If in such circumstances differences of a serious nature should arise between the Roman government and the representative endeavour and faith of the nation, there were two very different courses open to the latter. The first course was for the people to seek to avert what seemed to be unjust or unendurable by peaceable petition and the patient and inflexible persistence therein. Having the terrible Roman power to deal with, this appeared to be the safer course; it corresponds, too, the best with the spirit of a nation which made a boast of the true religion; and what a power, even when the mightiest Cæsars and their representatives have to be dealt with, can lie in the apparent helplessness of calm, death-defying petition! The

[1] See vol. v. pp. 404 sq.; 436 sq.

second course was to submit to be carried away to open, armed resistance by the provocations endured. In that case the most marvellous resolutions and deeds might spring forth from the hidden deeps of the consciousness and endeavour of this nation, as well as from its eager hopes and expectations; and it might seem as if the days of the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Syrian struggles and victories, which were now constantly so vividly recalled to memory, would come back again. Which of these two possible courses would actually be resorted to in each particular instance, and how far it would each time be followed, the result alone could teach. But it is true that at this time a hundred most powerful considerations advised far more the trial of the first than of the second of these courses, and it could not escape the calmer and deeper insight of men in Israel, that the risks were exceedingly great if the two most direct antagonisms of the age should come into irreconcilable collision with each other. But, what a Divine salvation and happy condition of things would then be possible, if the collision of these two antitheses, which were it is true in themselves incompatible, could possibly take such a form that, after the consummation which had long been in the nation so profoundly desired had actually arrived in the right manner, a salutary effect upon the greatest power of the ancient world, generally corresponding to the noblest element in Israel, should proceed from that one of the two which was infinitely superior to the other in true wisdom and religion!

The form of the whole history in this its last great stage, so far as it falls more obviously in the view of the world generally, is determined therefore by the form assumed by this collision of the fundamentally different nationalities and spiritual tendencies represented by them. It was inevitable that the collision between the two contrary powers, which were so incompatible and yet at this time in such close contact, should gradually assume the most extreme forms. It was of such a kind that it made itself felt immediately, and the only thing to be decided was, with what measure of foresight and shrinking from extremities, and for how long a time, by one or the other side, it should be restrained. But if the Community of the ancient true religion had been able to throw itself into this ultimately inevitable collision only in that shape and form which it had assumed since the rise of the Hagiocracy, this whole Community would in and with that form have proved itself frail and perishable. Moreover, the Divine treasures which the Community comprehended within it would have shared the same fate; and

yet that they might in some way be preserved and rendered effective, they must necessarily have a Community which understands them, and finds its best life in them. And in the course of the final period of the general history of the nation, there was a foreboding of what a terrible calamity this would be, and an involuntary and yet irresistible and mighty effort to escape such a disaster. The true *Consummation*, which could now come as the only proper one, really stirs at this time within the life of the nation. Although at first long almost hidden from the eyes of the world, it nevertheless reveals its immortal power; indeed, in secret it already exerts the most powerful and profound influence in the determination of the form and organisation which this last period of the history is to assume. Its life not only stirs and germinates, but it also takes a fully developed form before the great world observes clearly even its existence. This consummation is the *Christian Church*, the newly transfigured immortal Israel, which becomes more and more active and victorious in the wide world also in the course of the same *three stages* by which ancient Israel, whose place it now takes, gradually disintegrates as a nation by every one of its last spasmodic movements, and becomes finally extinct.

For, however irresistibly and rapidly this entire national history now approaches its final and unalterable crisis, it certainly long since attained an importance, and became of its kind too unique to permit its issue to be any other than the most tremendous and wonderful. It is just in this closing period that the most unexpected phenomena, the most extreme movements, and the strangest vicissitudes multiply. In the midst of the spasmodic overthrow of the people of this history there is begotten from it, as the noble and genuine fruit of the whole life of the nation, a new immortal Community which could proceed from it alone. It came at last at the right time before it was too late, and came in the one proper manner. And as its coming coincided with the approaching dissolution of the whole remaining ancient world, it became at the same time the imperishable germ of the universal consummation of human history. Accordingly, this final advance of the national history of Israel is of considerable extent, in spite of the rapidity of the terrible overthrow and unchecked dissolution; it is only after *three stages* have been passed through that at last everything reaches its end.

These three stages, as may be inferred from what has already been said, are determined essentially by the nature of the collision of the two great opposing forces themselves. The collision

follows at once, and the first moment of it even is in this case a beginning which answers completely to its final close. It is only because in this community there is from the very beginning a profound horror of the abyss which opens that the collision remains at first no more than transient and isolated. As a consequence in the *first stage* the healthier principles and tendencies become once more prevalent, the people gains unexpected advantages in its relation to the Romans, and, indeed, the germ of the perfect Consummation begins to stir, and already attains to imperishable life in the world. At the same time, inasmuch as the one true Consummation which could germinate here is rejected on account of its novelty and strangeness by the far larger portion of the Community, in the *second stage* the ancient Community comes to no true knowledge of the one salvation which is now possible. It suffers itself to be gradually misled more and more by these apparent victories over the Roman world. As a consequence it comes in spite of them into the most general, violent, and profound collision with it, and thereby loses anything that belonged to it of a temporal and mortal nature. But at the same time the new Community, in proportion as it, faithful to its own genius, holds aloof from all that, makes all the mightier advances in the midst of the ruins of the old one. In the *third stage*, the whole community, which now first comes into complete conflict both with the new Community and the rest of the world, once more rises for a last extreme effort in protection of its Hagiocracy; but this is only to pass away for ever in such a manner that it lives on henceforth in its own Consummation in ever-growing Christianity.

2. *The School of Hillel and its Opponents.*

If it is desired to comprehend more accurately how unavoidable that collision with the Roman power was at the very commencement of this new phase of the history, it is necessary to start from the condition, the aims, and the views of the learned schools which were then in Jerusalem. For it has already been shown at sufficient length[1] how it came to pass that, apart from the indestructible hopes of the Community, which, however, at this time rather remained in abeyance than operated with great energy, it was only in the heart of the learned studies and schools that its profoundest life and highest endeavour found perpetuation. It is true that these studies, in the case of the various schools of all the different sects into

[1] See vol. v. *passim*.

which the natural life of Israel had at that time long been broken up, centred around the Sacred Scriptures as the one revered altar-hearth of Divine thoughts, at which all the thoughts and endeavours of the progressive life of the people must be kindled, or, in any case, illuminated and purified. Still, in other respects, these schools differed greatly, according to the chief sects from which they proceeded.

The Essenes[1] followed undoubtedly their own peculiar line of study and philosophy; but it is unfortunate that we are at present unable to take any general and connected view of it. They early pass into other societies;[2] on this account their writings have not been preserved, and, least of all, in proportion as their writings were intended to promote the interests of the school merely. On the other hand, of their views much has passed into wider circles and been worked up into the books of other authors. Of their views in this form we have spoken in several places of this work. But in consequence of the characteristic tendencies of the sect they might very well develop a line of study devoted partly to the proper interpretation of their sacred Scriptures and partly to the principles and customs of their life; they could also, in conformity with their special tastes, occupy themselves much with the mysteries of the world and of secular and Divine things; but they could not develop a theory of politics and government. These questions about the high matters of empire and government, on the other hand, occupied, in conjunction with the most minute interpretation and application of the laws of the Pentateuch, the schools of the Sadducees and the Pharisees. But in the case of the schools of the former there was at this time hardly much originality; on the other hand, the Pharisees showed much activity of mind.

Just as we closed the former volume with a reference to the high perfection of this class of studies in the nation of that period, so at the commencement of this we must now consider more closely both the aims and the power of the schools which prosecuted them, because their aims and their power, though they had been for centuries slowly but steadily developing, were now for the first time compelled to put forth their ultimate consequences in opposition to the new Roman power. Never in the history of the world has the simple, unfettered school, which, without regarding the descent or rank of its scholars, maintains itself simply by the emulous capacity of its minds, and in favourable times enlarges with growing pride its in-

[1] See vol. v. pp. 370 sq. [2] As will be shown in the last volume [German].

fluence, become more completely a general ruling power than in all those centuries of the Hagiocracy. It laid hold of the true religion as its one province, invested itself practically without a rival with its power, and arrayed itself in the robe of its sanctity, governed its Community by its doctrines alone, and was in a position to attempt to seize the dominion of the world as the right of its undeniable truth. All other powers gradually declined through several centuries in the presence of its enchantment. It paralysed the native Asmonean royal power, undermined the half-heathen government of the Herods, for a long time held the terrible power of Rome in check, and indeed dared a life-and-death struggle with it. And though the power of the priests in Jahvéism, as the oldest and most sacred authority after the cessation of the power of the prophets, continued to support it, after all, this power of the priests followed it but as the shadow follows the light, and was compelled, after the destruction of the Temple, really to make way for it completely. So that at last this youngest and apparently weakest power was left entirely alone, in order that it might attempt the last thing that was possible to it.

It is difficult to find anything that can be compared with this phenomenon. The schools of the Greek sages were not greatly concerned about true religion; on that very account their history was entirely different. The school of Confucius in China, which still in our own time rules that empire of 365,000,000 of souls, aimed at ruling the nation simply by good habits and their discipline, without even deeply considering whence the good habits themselves are derived, so that this school must, in the end, lead to a simple government by the sabre. Neither can Islam be compared as something similar, save in certain minor respects. It is only the Papacy, with its court of scholars (its Curia), which would present most points of comparison, particularly as its adherents still in our own time especially boast that anyone, even the poorest, from any country in the world can become Pope, and so place his foot upon the heads of princes. But history has so clearly taught in the case of the Rabbinic School, as the chief example from antiquity in the early days of the rise of Christianity, what must at last be the outcome of every school of this kind, that no more instructive illustration for our own, and indeed for all times, can be expected.

Considering the great historical importance of this Rabbinic School (to call it thus for brevity's sake), the desire to

re-discover its history as accurately as possible in all its details, is very intelligible; but unfortunately the greatest difficulties oppose the satisfaction of the desire. A mere school, by its very nature, does not assume so obvious a place in the general history of the race as a powerful empire, although it may exert a very powerful influence upon the fortunes of nations and kingdoms. And the exceptionally miserable termination of this school, which had for centuries even held such a powerful sway, finally threw its dark shadow only too far over all its earlier history. A special history of the flourishing days of this school was probably never composed. Josephus, who in his historical works might have said much about it, mentions barely the most necessary facts about its doctrines and its divisions, manifestly because, as a man of a high priest's family, he was not in his advanced years any longer very well disposed toward it, although, like all educated Judeans, he had in his youth passed through it. As the Rabbis at length, in the completely altered times subsequent to the last Roman wars, gave up all thought of the melancholy remnant of the nation taking a foremost part again in the government at an early period, they confined themselves all the more exclusively to the work of ruling as the heads of schools. With this object in view they claimed, it is true, to be simply the successors of those heads of the schools who formerly exercised such powerful authority from Jerusalem, repeated zealously the sententious sayings and doctrines of those masters as far as they were still known, and after the third and fourth centuries of our era wrote the *Mishna*, in which not a few detached reminiscences of their sayings and teaching were preserved in writing. At that time, therefore, they might have felt the proper call to draw up, with as much fulness and trustworthiness as possible, a history of the Rabbinic School down to the destruction of Jerusalem, and to the war of Bar-cocheba. However, the great desolation without and the spiritual alienation within, which separated these declining remnants of the ancient nation from its own past and from all the world, had already become complete. Greek literature generally, which coincided with the flourishing period of that earlier school, had, with everything Christian and heathen, been long ago interdicted; the threads of historical development had been severed; a completely unhistorical habit of mind had become prevalent; and only the most meagre and scattered reminiscences from that earlier time had been preserved. In these circumstances,

the book *Pirqae Abôth* was produced, in which some of the general thoughts and sayings of the earlier teachers were collected according to their chronological order, as far as such an order could still be restored, at least, roughly.[1] Later still, some authors collected all sorts of things referring to the history of these 'Fathers,' that could then in any way be discovered and put together; but they were still less able to rise to true historical inquiry and composition, and gradually filled up the *lacunæ* by the aid of simple imagination.[2]

It is not, it is true, the general fortunes and the various divisions into which the school of Ezra gradually fell, which could be for us obscure; on the contrary, we have a sufficiently certain knowledge of them.[3] It is the peculiarities of the individual founders and continuators of the school which have become indistinct. We find in those sources names enough of such masters who were once famous, but of the lives—indeed, of the times when they lived—we know in most cases but very little. Even in the case of such a man as *Hillel* (with the surname *the elder*), whose name appears prominently before most of the rest, we are able at present to re-discover only with difficulty some idea of him as regards his special career and peculiarities. We must, nevertheless, in his case make a more detailed attempt, since, without some correct knowledge of him and his opponents, the momentous events at the very commencement of the new phase of the national history would not be intelligible.

1. The tract above referred to, *Pirqae Abôth*, which is generally our principal source here, does not help us much as to a closer understanding of Hillel's date. It enumerates the great teachers of Israel subsequent to the time of the *Great Synagogue*,[4] at first in a sort of chronological order, but without explaining this order by adding the years or any events the dates of which are well known. In the enumeration of these teachers it supplies also a kind of succession of masters, as if one or more of them had always been the pupils of those immediately preceding them, and thus seeks to present *pairs* of famous masters together, as if they must be conceived at least as contemporary, or even as labouring together; but it never says how this is to be understood in detail, and, according to many indications, the series of teachers which it supplies is

[1] This small tract has been received into the *Mishna*, but did not, like the others, find early interpreters.

[2] To this class belong such books as *Abôth de Rabbi Nathan*, which is generally printed in the large Talmud collections, *Jûchasin*, and others.

[3] See vol. v.

[4] See vol. v. pp. 168 sq.

itself after all incomplete.[1] This is also easily explained from the fact that it intended to distinguish only those teachers from whom it could quote famous *sayings*. Thus it places together the pair *Hillel* and *Shammai* as pupils of *Shemaja* and *Abtalion*, and commences a kind of *Qabbâla*, or oral tradition, of the teaching of *the men of the Great Synagogue*, by means of a closer succession of this kind of teachers and disciples, precisely down to Hillel and Shammai with their pupils, Jonathan the son of Zakkai [2] and his five pupils, while subsequent to the time of Hillel and Shammai it introduces other teachers also without any such closer connection with their masters.[3] From this we

[1] As we plainly see—e.g. from *M.* חגיגה, ii. 2. At this place, also, on occasion of a single question, the opinions of all the oldest teachers in such a succession are quoted; and it appears thence, as well as from other passages of the Mishna, that a reminiscence, although but obscure, of such a chronological, or rather personal, succession of great teachers, had been preserved as late as the third century after Christ. But there is no reason whatever to suppose, as is done in the later conceptions of the matter, that the first of such a *pair* of teachers was the *Nasi* (*prince* of the school); the second, the *Ab bêth dîn* (*father of judgment, first judge*).—As such pairs are mentioned between *Antigonus of Sôkhô* (vol. v. p. 275) and *Shema'ja-Abtalion*, the three only—*Jose* son of *Jo'ezer* from *Sserêda* (comp. as to this city, vol. ii. p. 386), and *Jose* son of *Jochanan*, from Jerusalem; *Josua* son of *Perachja* and *Nittâi*, or rather, according to the older reading of the Jerusalem Gem., *Matthâi* of Arbêl; *Judah* son of *Tabbâi*, and *Shim'on* son of *Shetach*. In Josephus there is no certain trace of any one of these three pairs; and for what is narrated about them here and there in the Talmudic writings it is equally difficult to assign a place in the thread of the events as regards its chronological order. All that can be gathered with historical probability is that the first two pairs place plainly before our eyes the origin of the Pharisees and the Essenes. The second of each pair speaks, as may be gathered from his maxims, like a founder of the school of thought of the Essenes, the first of each pair like a founder of that of the Pharisees. And it is not difficult to perceive why the teacher with Essene tendencies takes the second place in each case in the series of pairs. The last of these pairs, of which more scattered reminiscences exist, is of another kind. Both were, to judge both from their favourite sayings and from reminiscences of other kinds, influential doctors of the law and judges, founders also of schools for the practice of judicial proceedings. In this they had manifestly great merit, and may have flourished in the first half of the last century before Christ. With regard to *Judah* son of *Perachja*, who is above placed in the time of King Jannæus (vol. v. p. 386), and who is said to have fled into Egypt in the fourth year of the king's reign (viz. 100 B.C.) from fear of him, see also what has to be said below.

[2] As to this much later man, see vol. vii. pp. 41 sq. [German].

[3] It creates surprise that the sayings of Hillel, *Abôth*, i. 12-14, are not continued before (ii. 4–7) but after the sayings of Shammai (i. 15) are interrupted by the sayings of others (i. 16—ii. 4), while these others are enumerated without the continuous thread of the *Qabbâla*; but, on the contrary, the latter appears once more in the case of Jochanan, son of Zakkai, with his five pupils (ii. 8). In this order, as it is now, it is true, nothing can be altered; but we are unable to believe that it was originally as we now find it, and are of opinion that the book must really have had a better order at first. To this must be added, that the sayings of Gamaliel and his son Simeon which are now introduced (i. 16, 17) immediately after that of Shammai, and are therefore manifestly intended to be from Gamaliel I. and his son, from the time before the destruction of Jerusalem, must date, on the contrary, as their meaning and manner show, from the time subsequent to that event. For if this Gamaliel says, *Procure thee a master and get thee forth from doubt! and tithe not too much by guess-work!* this plainly dates from that time after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the schools, with

see only, that in the third or fourth century after Christ the unbroken connection and the continuation of that teaching which was regarded as genuine, viz. that of the Pharisees, appeared but little interrupted down to the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Rabbis who flourished subsequently were regarded more as isolated teachers.

Since we therefore get from that little tract no adequate idea of the age when Hillel flourished, we must look about for other reports. Such a one comes to us from Jerome, who on one occasion incidentally remarks,[1] that Shammai (whom he places first as by accident) and Hellel (as he always spells his name) did not arise much before the birth of Christ, and that from them descended the Scribes (as they are called in the New Testament) and Pharisees, whose school was continued by (the well-known) Rabbi ʿAqîba. The pre-eminent importance of these two teachers is accordingly fully recognised by Jerome also; but from the fact that he here really intends to say, that the sect of Jewish Christians called Nazarenes, which at least existed from the third century after Christ, interpreted the *two houses of Israel* mentioned Is. viii. 11, 12 (in a very arbitrary manner, it must be allowed), of the two Rabbinical schools of Hillel and Shammai, we get much earlier evidence for both points. Still, how long the two teachers flourished before Christ, we do not learn therefrom with sufficient accuracy. However, with the evidence of Jerome the reminiscence in the Babylonian Gemara harmonises thus tolerably well, according to which Hillel with his three successors were the well-known heads of schools for a hundred years previous to the destruction of the

their laws, were completely disorganised, the common people did not well know how they were to act, e.g. with regard to the tithes at a time which was suddenly so greatly changed, and the schools of the Rabbis were not yet set up afresh. We know also from other sources that the question about the tithes was then much discussed (vol. vii. pp. 57, 348) [German]. The saying of his son, also, *All my days I grew up amongst the wise, and found nothing better for a man than silence*, points to a time when the Rabbis alone were the leaders of Israel. The other saying of this same Simeon in this series is not from an earlier time, because it quotes as its authority a Biblical passage by the phrase שנאמר, *because it is said*. This constant custom does not occur before those times subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem, as will be shown below in the case of Hillel.

[1] In his *Comment.* on Isa. viii. 11, 12. The six Rabbis whom he here brings together as teaching after the times of R. ʿAqîba, and among whom Jochanan the son of Zakkai is the second, are not, it must be allowed, so considered according to strict chronological arrangement. But from that fact one simply sees how extremely uncertain the chronology, when it entered into details, was already amongst the Rabbinical teachers of Jerome. ʿAqîba was at least the most active and famous of these seven, so that he could easily be placed first.—Jerome also here explains in his own way the two proper names quite incorrectly, as *Dissipator* and *Profanus*. שַׁמַּאי, or שַׁמָּי, is rather equivalent to *Mirabilis*, and הִלֵּל to *Laudatus*.

Temple.[1] It must be allowed that this reminiscence also is manifestly not free from much vagueness; and yet in all the books of the Rabbis there is no more definite chronological note to be found.

If, however, these two teachers were, according to all agreeing witnesses, so unusually important that they directly represented the two most influential teachers of the Pharisees of the times before the destruction of Jerusalem, we should surely expect that Josephus would not have left them without any mention whatever in his great historical works. Now, as a fact, we find, about the time at which we should expect them according to the above vague indications, two teachers expressly mentioned by him as the most famous Pharisees of those days, whom even a Herod did not venture to touch. When Herod had conquered Jerusalem with Roman help in the year 37 B.C., and took the most severe vengeance on his opponents, amongst whom were many of the most esteemed Pharisees and other teachers, he put, on the other hand, greatest honour on the Pharisee Pollion and his pupil Sameas, because during the siege they had exhorted their fellow-citizens to yield.[2] And yet this was the same Sameas who had, some ten years earlier, dared in the chief council almost alone to raise his voice in warning against the illegalities of the young prince Herod and to call for his capital punishment;[3] so completely had he changed since then in his bearing towards him. Both are subsequently mentioned once more as men in their time of the highest importance in Herod's history. When as late as the year 20 B.C. he required from everybody a new oath of allegiance, and desired also to persuade the former pupils (who were already dispersed through the country) of these two teachers as well as most of their present ones (viz. the elder ones) to take it,[4] these Pharisees, particularly at Pollion's suggestion, resisted his will; and yet he remitted all punishment in their case from special respect for Pollion. A more honourable proof of the firmness of Pollion and of the high esteem in which he was then held by the whole

[1] Shabbâth, fol. 15*a ad fin.* The words are:—הלל ושמעון גמליאל ושמעון נהגו נשיאותן לפני הבית מאת שנה

Hillel and Simeon, Gamaliel and Simeon, 'held their headships of the office of Nasi 100 years *before* (the destruction of the, or more briefly before) *the Temple*;' whence it plainly appears how perfectly general this enumeration of the four generations of heads of schools is meant to be.

[2] See vol. v. p. 413.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 407.

[4] This is the meaning of the words *τοὺς περὶ Πολλίωνα τὸν Φαρισαῖον καὶ Σαμέαν καὶ τῶν ἐκείνοις συνδιατριβόντων τοὺς πλείστους.*—Jos. *Ant.* xv. 10. 4. Neither can one help seeing that, according to Josephus's narration, both must have then been still alive, although Sameas is here placed greatly in the background. Comp. vol. v. p. 423.

nation could not indeed be given; and if that were all we knew of this Pharisee, we should always have to hold him in great honour.

Nothing is more natural than that we should be tempted to regard these two men as the same as those who were connected in these late Rabbinical reminiscences by the names Hillel and Shammai. The high renown and the universal esteem, commanding reverence, in which precisely these two men must have once stood as the most distinguished persons of all the Pharisees, we find confirmed both in the later accounts and in Josephus; and as far as agreement can at all be expected in the case of these two wholly dissimilar sources, we get it here. No important difficulties can be created by the fact that, according to Josephus Sameas is Pollion's pupil, while according to the later accounts, both alike are pupils of Shemaja and Abtalion. For even in the later reminiscences Hillel is always placed before Shammai, and moreover they elsewhere state that Shammai himself was at first Hillel's pupil, and did not become his colleague until later. We find too in the later traditions regarding Pollion a reflection of even the advanced age which he must have reached according to the indications in Josephus. In these traditions it is said that he reached the age of 120 years, and spent the first forty of them without learning, the next forty in acquiring it, and the last forty as a teacher. And superficial as this transference of a well-known tradition about Moses to him is, it shows nevertheless that a very long term of tutorial activity was always ascribed to him.—The fact may also be adduced, that this interpretation of the names Pollion and Sameas which the words of Josephus met with is the oldest known to us, since in the work of Josippon the Hebrew names Hillel and Shammai are always substituted for them.[1]

It is only the assignment of these two names which creates a further difficulty here, inasmuch as we do not know expressly from any ancient account that the names Hillel and Pollion are meant to designate the same most famous Pharisee. It may in any case be readily supposed, it is true, that a Jew of reputation, assumed at that time a Greek or Roman name, which was commonly used by the Greek writers of the period, and is accordingly used by Josephus, whilst amongst those who spoke the Jewish

[1] Josippon v. 4, 13, 24, in Breithaupt's edition. This late narrator, as well as the Rabbis, makes also a Menahem, together with Shammai, Hillel's earliest pupil and then a respected teacher, in which case we could not suppose a confusion with the Essene Menahem in Josephus (comp. below).

language it was less accepted, and was subsequently wholly forgotten. Nor could such a Jew, if he lived before the time of Cæsar and Augustus, call himself Pollio after the Roman manner, since this Roman name was not so common earlier. But that Hillel at that time gave to his name this Roman form is not told us elsewhere. As, however, one of the two predecessors of our Hillel was called, according to Rabbinical tradition (as above), Abtalion, and this name, which may be of Jewish origin,[1] in sound resembles Pollion more than Hillel, the conjecture is natural, that the Pollion of Josephus is not Hillel but Abtalion. And since, according to the same Rabbinical reminiscence (as was remarked above), Shemaja is constantly associated with Abtalion, we should in that case be able also to recognise in the former the teacher called Sameas by Josephus; indeed, a name like Shemaja seems to admit more easily than Shammai of transformation into the Greek Sameas. Shemaja and Abtalion would thus be the famous Pharisees Pollion and Sameas in Josephus; and Hillel and Shammai would have to be placed not less than a generation later.[2] However, all this would only be based upon an apparently preponderating similarity of the one pair of names over the other, which, after all, of itself proves nothing.[3]

While therefore the orthography of the names by no means compels us to adopt such a supposition, on the other hand, serious doubts arise against it. The bare fact that, according to constant traditionary custom, Shemaja always precedes Abtalion is not in its favour. These two masters, however, were by no means of such celebrity that we could easily put them in the place of Hillel and Shammai. And the saying of Shemaja's, which was always remembered as the most important

[1] Formed from a possible simple, not compound, name of a man טַלְיוֹן, acc. § 273*c* of Hebrew Gram.

[2] A third possible case, namely, that Shemaja and Abtalion in the Rabbinical reminiscences are only different names for Hillel and Shammai, would be absolutely groundless.

[3] For the name Shema'ja, as it must be spoken according to the Massora, would in Greek be Σαμαΐας rather than Σαμέας; the LXX. render שמעיה generally by Σαμαΐας, and Josephus likewise, *Ant.* viii. 10. 3; Ἡσαΐας, Ὡσαΐας (הוֹשַׁעְיָה), Μαασαΐας, Παταΐας (פְּתַחְיָה), which do not admit of further contraction, are similar. On the other hand, the name Shammai remains in Greek without a duplicate *m*, and has primarily the form Σαμάϊ, but this form easily takes a more Grecian aspect as Σαμαΐος, which can again undergo a dialectic change and become Σαμέας, like Ἀρισταΐος, and so many similar names, into Ἀριστέας. The two names, in Hebrew characters and in the Massoretic vocalisation dissimilar enough, assume thus, more easily a like form in the Greek, and are frequently interchanged in the manuscripts of Josephus. But of itself the form Σαμέας points rather to our Shammai. It is obvious that Abtalion could easily change his name to Pollion in case the Roman Pollio had been so famous in his day; but it does not appear why Hillel also should not have been able to take such a Roman-Greek name, since the prevalent Greek-Roman names which Jews adopted did not always arise by means of

memorial of him,[1] '*Love work, and hate the chief doctorate (or dominance of the learned),*[2] *and make not thyself the confidant of princes,*' contains nothing by which we could recognise the hot-tempered Shammai. But Abtalion's saying to his pupils, '*Ye wise, be cautious with your speech, lest ye bring upon you the debt of exile and go to the place where the evil waters are: then your later disciples might drink thereof and die, so that the name of Heaven would be profaned,*' transfers us in the most vivid manner to the times immediately after Pompey had in the year 63 B.C. carried away so many Jews captive, when the fear might be entertained that those who had been banished to Rome would fall entirely into the evil water of heathenism, and their descendants be thereby altogether corrupted.[3] We can also quite well suppose that he flourished about the year 63 B.C.

We find, therefore, in the end, no difficulty in supposing that the Pollion of Josephus is Hillel;[4] and if this is settled, we can accordingly fix the time when he flourished as the years 60–10 B.C., shortly after Abtalion. If the Gamaliel who is mentioned in the New Testament is really according to ancient tradition his grandson, the time of the latter would also accord well therewith.

As regards his origin, too, Hillel is a remarkable man, inasmuch as the later sources can narrate of him the two things, that he had been a young immigrant from Babylon, and in addition a descendant of David's by his wife Abital.[5] It is true these later sources narrate much that is in the highest degree unintelligible and doubtful of the men and things of those times; as, for instance, they claim to know of Abtalion

the easiest transformation of the letters of their Jewish names.

[1] *P. Aboth*, i. 10.

[2] The genuinely Rabbinical word, רַבָּנוּת can scarcely be more concisely rendered; it expresses exactly the serious danger to which every form of a ruling learned caste, i.e. Rabbinism, was from the very first exposed, a danger which we thus see this Shemaja had so early profoundly perceived. This saying shows at the same time that the use of the Aramaic words רַב for *teacher*, and רַבָּן acc. § 163*c*, for *chief-teacher*, was, in fact, quite common a considerable time before Christ, a point which has been so foolishly called in question in our times (see below); the same fact may also be perceived in the genuinely Pharisaic saying,

עֲשֵׂה לְךָ רַב וּקְנֵה לְךָ חָבֵר

comp. vol. v. p. 368, which acc. *M.* אבות i. 6, Joshua, the son of Perachja (who must be estimated acc. p. 14), insisted upon at the period of the origin of the Pharisees.

[3] The *evil waters*, therefore, convey the same moral meaning as Ps. lxxiii. 9, only with a different application, because referring to other circumstances and persons. But Ezekiel also, xxxvi. 20–23, speaks very similarly to his own time.

[4] In this way Jost's errors in his last work are, it is believed, sufficiently refuted.

[5] Who is mentioned 2 Sam. iii. 4. Similarly the genealogy of Christ, given Luke iii. 22, goes back to another son of David than Solomon.

and Shemaja, the predecessors of Hillel and Shammai, above mentioned, that they were descendants of the Assyrian king Sennacherib, and that their mother only was of Jewish blood.[1] However, we have every reason on other grounds to suppose that he descended from the eastern Jews, and had come from Parthia, while yet young, to Jerusalem. For in general Biblical studies flourished most admirably from early times amongst the eastern Judeans, as I have proved elsewhere.[2] Educated youths from that quarter, thirsting for more knowledge, may not infrequently have helped afresh to fertilise the studies which could easily stagnate in exclusion and undue attention to certain points; and there would be little to create surprise if this greatest of the Rabbis of Jerusalem, like his great predecessor Ezra, had come from the east to revive Biblical studies, with the wide difference only that Ezra was in his day of a priestly descent while Hillel was already of a completely lay descent and secular profession. We know, however, definitely that under Herod, and attracted by his fame, several very distinguished Babylonian Jews immigrated into Palestine,[3] and can easily suppose that the same thing occurred before if not very frequently. To this must be added that the Aramaic language has left its peculiar mark particularly on certain of the sayings of Hillel which were subsequently always quoted as from him;[4] indeed, it is often found in the words also which are ascribed to him in the stories.[5] He is the first Rabbi who was subsequently most naturally and by preference thought of as speaking a language with Aramaic peculiarities. In this fact lies plainly further evidence of his Aramaic native

[1] All of which might in itself not be impossible, if we could only corroborate it by earlier evidence.

[2] See vol. v. pp. 131 sq. and vol. vii. p. 415 [German].

[3] As the place where very many of such immigrants were settled by Herod, *Bathyra*, in the ancient Bashan beyond the Jordan, is mentioned, Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii. 2. 2; but this place could probably also be written בתירה, and so the narration in the *G. Jer.* פסחים, fol. 33 *ad init.*, comes to our assistance, according to which *the Elders of Bathîra* proposed, while he was still quite young, to Hillel, because he was known to them as a pupil of Shemaja and Abtalion's, a legal question which none of themselves could answer, and made him, when he answered it, their *Nasî*. If this story had been strictly historical, we might be inclined to infer from it that Hillel had first immigrated with these Babylonians who settled in Bathîra during Herod's later years, and was at first acknowledged simply by them as a teacher. But the story appears from its whole tone not very historical, and the only thing that we can learn from it probably is, that as a Babylonian he was specially beloved amongst these immigrant settlers in Bathîra. Still later tradition subsequently made of these *Elders of Bathîra* intermediate teachers between Shemaja-Abtalion and Hillel-Shammai.

[4] They are the sayings *P. Abôth* i. 13, ii. 6, which have to be explained below; in the case of the latter one a story in a Hebrew dress accompanies it, by which the difference of the languages may be more plainly perceived, e.g. צָפָה *to swim*, together with the synonymous Aramaic טוּף.

[5] Comp. the long story *Shabbath*, fol. 31*a*, explained below.

country, which could easily be still further substantiated by a more general consideration of the two Talmudic languages.[1]

2. Undoubtedly the greatness of Hillel's mind appears also in the fact that, although he had immigrated from Babylonia, and continued to speak by preference Aramaic, his reputation was, nevertheless, uncommonly great in the learned school of Jerusalem, and he was long regarded by the people, amid all the vicissitudes of the government in Jerusalem, indeed, under a Herod, even down to his death, as the most important man next to the king and his court. But we do not see anywhere that he was specially revered during his life on account of his descent from David. The time had long since passed away when much weight could in actual life be attached to such a descent, although it may be easily understood that his adherents should afterwards desire to preserve this particular distinction from oblivion.[2]

Now, when his whole career was subsequently looked upon to discover its unusual characteristic features, there was nothing which seemed so memorable as the lofty gentleness, mildness and kindness which never forsook him in all the various situations of his life. Innumerable characteristic incidents of this were subsequently related, and related all the more fondly as later times grew more and more unhappy and gloomy, as if in order to cheer hearer and listener by the recollection of the most cheering and generally attractive feature of those earlier days. Such characteristic incidents could then be the more strikingly brought forward and vividly painted, inasmuch as an equal number of reminiscences of the totally opposite nature of Shammai could easily be contrasted with them as their shadow, and these two colleagues and contemporaries were regarded generally by later times as perfect contrasts to each other. The most charming pieces of picturesque

[1] For it is quite wrong to suppose that the *Mishna-Hebrew*, or as it can also be called, the *New-Hebrew*, was a purely learned language, used only in the schools, pretty much as the *New-Rabbinic* language in the middle-ages. On the contrary, it bears the marks of a genuine popular language, because it is generally as perfectly a further spontaneous development of the ancient Hebrew as any popular language can be. Comp. vol. v. p. 464 note. But it is true enough that the Aramaic at that time was already too firmly rooted to be displaced, not merely in Galilee and in a slightly different form in Samaria, but also in Jerusalem and Judea; and after the brief vigorous start which the New-Hebrew had made as a language after the Maccabean times, the Aramaic became, in spite of it, finally the language of the people, so that the New-Hebrew was preserved only in the learned schools of Palestine, whilst a man like Hillel was at the same time tolerated as speaking Aramaic.

[2] All this is of importance on account of the similar question regarding Christ's Davidic descent; and as there is no reason for denying it in the case of Hillel, we have as little occasion to deny it under very similar circumstances in the case of Christ, as will be shown below.

narrative of this kind then arose in abundance, and the proverb was coined, *Let a man be always gentle like Hillel*, and *not hasty like Shammai*. In illustration of this it was customary to give the following stories, which also still depict very faithfully many peculiar features of those times which are for us so important on account of the nearness of the coming of Christ:[1]—

'Once two men laid a wager of 400 silverlings as to which of them could soonest provoke Hillel in his house to anger: and one of them offered to win the wager. It was just then the evening before the Sabbath, and Hillel was occupied in shaving his head; the interruption must, therefore, have been doubly unpleasant. Still, the man went before the door of Hillel's house and called aloud, asking whether he was there. Hillel threw at once a garment round him, and asked what the man desired. He had a question to put to him, answered the latter. Hillel offered to answer him, and accordingly he put the question, why the heads of the Babylonians were so round. Hillel replied to him with a smile, that that was really a great question. The cause was that they had careful midwives. After a while the man came again and asked, in exactly the same circumstances, why the eyes of the Palmyrians[2] were so dark.[3] He answered, however, with the same smile, "Because they dwell amongst the sand-hills"! Again, after a while he returned and asked, in the same circumstances, why the feet of the Africans were so broad; and with the same smile Hillel answered him, "Because they dwell amongst watery bogs"! When the man then added that he had still much to ask him, but feared he might get displeased, Hillel proceeded to put on his dress completely and seated himself before the man, with the request that he would put as many questions as he desired. Then he asked him, first, whether he was the famous Hillel; and on hearing this affirmed, added, "if he was really Hillel, it was to be desired that there should not be many like him in Israel"; and being pleasantly questioned as to the reason of this strange desire, he said, "Because he had lost 400 silverlings through him." "Just so," replied Hillel; "be well on your guard! Hillel is man enough that thou shouldst lose

[1] *Shabbâth* fol. 30*b* last line, and 31*a*.

[2] תדמוריא, as must probably be read instead of תרמודיא; *Tarmudeans* would have to be the inhabitants of some small otherwise unknown place; but such an unknown race would not accord with the other two mentioned—the Babylonians and Africans.

[3] תרוטות, or rather טרוטות, according to a better reading, probably answers in the first instance to the Syriac ܛܪܘܛܝ and is accordingly thus understood above; subsequently the word seems to have become obscure to the Rabbis themselves, and to have been arbitrarily interpreted by them as *round*, which in this connection gives no sense.

twice 400 silverlings about him, whilst Hillel will not get angry!"'

'There came once a heathen before Shammai with the question, how many fundamental laws[1] the Jews had. He replied to him that they had two, the written and the oral. As the man then said that he believed him with regard to the written law, but not as regards the oral, and desired that he would on this condition accept him as a proselyte to teach him the first, Shammai rated him and thrust him away with vehemence. So he went to Hillel: he accepted him at once, and the first day taught him the A B C. But the next day Hillel said it to him backwards, so that he exclaimed, "Surely yesterday he had not said that to him!" "Hast thou not now," replied Hillel to him, "leaned upon me? The oral law also leans upon me."—Another time a heathen came to Shammai with the request that he would accept him as a proselyte in such a manner that he would teach him perfectly the whole law while he was standing on one foot. Him he drove away with the measuring-rod which he held in his hand. So he went to Hillel. He accepted him as a proselyte, with the saying, "That which is to thee hateful do not to thy neighbour.[2] This is the whole law; the rest is its interpretation; go away and practise it."—Again, another heathen once went past behind the synagogue and heard how the reader was just reading, "*These are the garments which they shall make: the Choshen, Ephod . . . .*"[3] As he then learned on inquiry that they were for the high priest, he thought to himself he would become a proselyte in order that he might be made a high priest, went to Shammai, and requested him upon this condition to make him a proselyte; but he thrust him away with the measuring-rod which was in his hand. So he went to Hillel, and he received him as a proselyte, with the words, "Is anyone appointed king save him who knows the statutes of the kingdom? Go, learn these!" So the heathen set himself then

[1] Properly *Thôra*, according to the well-known historical signification of the word. This narrative of the two *Thôra* is of great importance also in relation to the nature of the Pharisaic-Rabbinic school; the same view reappears in Christendom as that of the Papists, and this is defended by conceits like those of these Pharisees. However, although the ingenuity of Hillel may be able to conceal for the moment, it cannot remove that which even ingenuous heathen feel is wrong in the view.

[2] דעלך סני לחברך לא תעביד. I have already shown in my *History of Israel*, v. p. 210, that this saying is much older; and similar sayings are found also in Isocrates, *Nicocles*, i. 7; ii. 12–14, although their form is different. It occurs to a nation of finer culture everywhere naturally, and is, therefore, certainly not uttered in the New Testament for the first time.

[3] From Ex. xxviii. 4. The instance which now follows is certainly the most marked of the three, and it is not easy to avoid seeing that there is a gradation in the series.

to the reading of the law. Yet as soon as he came to the words, *but the stranger who cometh too near let him be slain*,[1] he asked to whom this passage referred. Hillel said to him, that it referred to no less a person than Israel's king, David. All the more the proselyte referred it to himself, and thought, what must Israel be whose members are called *sons of God*,[2] and of whom it is said, from the love wherewith He loves them, *my firstborn son is Israel*;[3] that regarding them it is written, *but the stranger who cometh too near let him be slain*! So he hastened, in spite of his staff and his travelling wallet with which he came, just as he was,[4] before Shammai, and exclaimed to him, "Am I able to become high priest? Does it not stand in the law, *but the stranger who cometh too near let him be put to death*?" and went to Hillel, exclaiming to him, "Gentle Hillel, let all blessings fall upon thy head, that thou hast brought me under the wings of the Divine glory!"—After some days all three met together and said, "The passionateness of Shammai sought to drive us out of the world; the gentleness of Hillel has brought us under the wings of the Divine glory!"'

Vividly, however, as such detached characteristic stories enable us to cast a glance into the peculiar gentleness, and no less into the versatility, quickness of perception, and adroitness of Hillel's mind, they are still not sufficient to reveal to us clearly the deepest basis of his thoughts and aims. But happily several memorial sayings of a more general sense have in addition come down from him by the aid of which the peculiarities of his mind can be much more closely looked into. These sayings do not, it is true, exist in very large numbers, but yet they are far more numerous than those of any other Rabbi of those times;[5] and we place them together here in the order which best suits our object.

One of the shortest of these sayings, but undoubtedly the most comprehensive, profound, and original in its significance of all, is the following: *If I am not mine, who is mine? yet when*

[1] The warning against desecration of the mysteries, which is often repeated from Num. i. 51 onwards, since the ark of the covenant was regarded as not to be touched by any save the priests. Hillel thereby brings the ambitious heathen to proper perception, in that he shows him how every member of the community is a son of God, and can therewith be the highest that a man can strive after; but that the deeper regulations of the kingdom, which do not give permission even to a king to do everything, may not be thereby abrogated.

[2] Acc. Deut. xiv. 1.

[3] Acc. Ex. iv. 22.

[4] The phrase על אחת כמה וכמה is exactly the same *G. Jer.* תענית, fol. 69*b*, line 9; *Babyl.* קדושים, fol. 31*a*, גיטין, fol. 35*a*.

[5] *P. Abôth*, i. 12–14; ii. 4–7.

I am mine, what am I? and if not now at once, when then? It is as if the grand but simple utterance, Ps. lxxiii. 25, had here been extended to a threefold utterance which exhausts the profoundest thoughts that can exist in the human consciousness. For the thought here at the commencement apparently goes beyond that sacred passage of the Psalm, in that the man seeks to get a proper apprehension of his own nature simply by retreating within himself—*if I am not mine*, do not before all things fully belong to myself with my full free-will and power, not being the servant and subject of others, *who am I?* otherwise is living worth the trouble? But the true man thus apprehends his own personality in the first instance in his own most individual power and freedom, as in contrast with the whole world external to himself, in order the next moment the more profoundly to perceive a limitation far above him and his own mortal nothingness, *yet if I am mine*, imagine I can live selfishly without God and without love, *what am I?* am I not in that case rather the weakest and most wretched of creatures! Therefore, if I must, after all, have God and can find my true strength and blessedness only in Him, why do I delay to surrender myself to Him wholly and to Him alone? until what time then should I think of still waiting? in this case must it not be, *and if not now* forthwith, *then when?*[1] With this thought the threefold utterance is completed; if we had only this one saying from Hillel, we should be greatly indebted to him; for a true thought could hardly be expressed in a briefer, and at the same time more profound and glowing manner than is the case with this.

Most of his memorial sayings contain, it is true, something which refers more or less directly to his Rabbinical aims: which can create no surprise in the case of a man whose mind was directed so exclusively to scholastic affairs. Sayings of that kind also remained most easily in the memory of his successors. A very simple one of these runs, *Be thou of Aaron's disciples, loving peace and seeking for peace, loving the creatures and attracting them to the Law!* And yet, simple as it is, it is one of the most beautiful and most characteristic of his aims. He himself was not by birth a priest, neither were most of his pupils; and the ancient priestly institutions were not very

[1] The Rabbinical עַכְשָׁיו, *now*, is contracted from עַד כְּשָׁעָה, *until as the hour is, even immediately, just now*; for precisely this שָׁעָה is the original form of שׁוּעָה, *hour*, acc. § 186 *b*, since the word as derived from שׁעה, *to look*, signifies of itself *a glance*, a moment; the Syriac ܫܥܐ which corresponds in meaning, is from the same שׁוּעה, although greatly shortened in another way, and not in the same compound.

applicable to these late times. But this did not keep him from fully acknowledging and reviving for his own time whatever had once lived in the priestly tribe,[1] so far as it was great and important for the promotion of true religion, just as in reality much that only the priests in Israel had attended to formerly now passed into the province of the Rabbis. The revival of the best part of those things which formerly under the ancient priestly tribe worked beneficially in the community was the highest wish that could be expressed for Rabbinism; this revival was too little successful, and the words of Hillel which bore such a meaning were only too little followed.

One of the earliest and also most incisive of Hillel's sayings, which was one of the most artistically expressed, and in the Aramaic dialect, was without doubt the following: *Whoever reviles the name* (i.e. God), *his name perishes;*[2] *and whoever does not increase* (particularly also the kingdom and honour of God), *he diminishes,* so that merely not to revile is not enough. With which was generally connected as a related saying, *Whoever has learned nothing must be charged with homicide,*[3] commits against himself and the world as great a sin as if he had killed himself or other persons; nevertheless, as much knowledge too often puffs up, and the dangers of learned conceit and of Rabbinical lust of power had then long been known, it is further said as in antithesis, *but he that assumes to himself the crown,* i.e., the government, *let him be gone!*[4] The last saying also has a perfectly similar tone, and originates manifestly from the same temper of mind; yet it is probably better not connected so immediately with the first.

More flowing and easier in style and character are the following, and they bring out more and more the great doctor of the Law, who makes everything refer especially to his favourite law-

[1] How correctly this is expressed as regards the early history also has been further discussed, *History of Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 141 sq., 178 sq., *Antiquities*, pp. 265 sq.

[2] שְׁמָא, *the Name*, must be here an Aramaic translation of הַשֵּׁם, and therefore, like the latter, the well-known Rabbinic circumlocution for *God*, which, however, was older and better than the Rabbinic הַמָּקוֹם: it was here the more suitably used for *God*, as the intended paronomasia would then be obtained. נניד from נזף *to smite, ill-treat*, is also quite Aramaic, and can here refer to mistreatment by means of words only, as חֵרֶף, and the like: but it must probably be pointed נָנֵיד = נָנֶיךָ acc. § 152 *b,c.* יסף must be pointed יְסֵיף from סוֹף *end.*

[3] יליף must be pointed יְלִיף as perf. Qal, like בָּטַח; but קַטְלָא חַיָּב, *cædem* (cædis) *reus est*, is expressed with unusual brevity, though it seems to admit no other explanation.

[4] That the *crown* can here only signify the rule, e.g. by the Law, is plain: but אִשְׁתַּמֵּשׁ is used in the bad sense of *usurpare*; the perfect, acc. § 357 *b*. Précisely the last saying is quoted as one of Hillel's by a later teacher in the *P. Abôth* itself, iv. 7.

studies. *Endeavour not to be better than the community,*[1] *and trust not in thyself until the day of thy death! And judge not thy neighbour until thou comest into his place,*[2] *and think of nothing that it will not be easily heard, for in the end it must be heard.*[3] *Neither think that thou wilt put off learning until the time when thou hast leisure: how easily mayst thou never have it!* The first of these sayings especially is one of the choicest, and, if it had always been followed, Pharisees—that is, pietistic separatists—would never have been heard of, either in name or reality. And it is surprising that Hillel, although a Pharisee, should thus express himself: yet this is not the only instance in which a distinguished teacher seeks to oppose a fundamental error of the tendency of his own party; and, moreover, the Pharisees had undoubtedly not given themselves this nickname. The following series of sayings introduces us most completely into the habits of those times: *The more flesh one hath*[4] *the more worms, the more treasures the more care, the more women the more superstition, the more maids the more unchastity, the more men-servants the more theft;* (but also) *the more Law the more life,*[5] *the more schools of Law the more wisdom, the more counsel the more insight, the more righteousness the more peace. If one gains a good name, one gains it for oneself; if one gains knowledge of the Law, one gains the life to come.*

It is true the last words make us also feel the narrowness of the Pharisees; and the commencement of the following series of sayings still more serves as a sign that, after all, this most liberal-minded Pharisee did not remain untouched by the deeper general error of his school. *No uneducated man is quick to shrink from sin, no man of the people*[6] *is religious. No one who is too timid learns well, and no one who is too angry teaches*

[1] אַל תִּפָּרֵשׁ מִן הַצִּבּוּר, a saying which is also quoted from a Rabbi Ssadôq (*R. Abôth*, iv. 7), but there in another connection. It is probably much earlier than Hillel, who here, like Ssadôq in the passage referred to, simply makes it the connecting point for his own further thoughts; and the saying may in that case have at first supplied the occasion for the origination of the caricature name of Pharisees, i.e. the *Separatists*.

[2] Much the same meaning, therefore, as that of the famous saying with regard to one's neighbour, p. 23.

[3] This appears to me to be the only proper meaning of this saying.

[4] E.g. to give sumptuous feasts with. The phrase about women refers to polygamy, which still existed.

[5] *Life* here quite in the high sense of the New Testament, a sense which is, however, already found in the Old Testament.

[6] עַם הָאָרֶץ, literally *people of the land*: the expression is to a considerable degree contemptuous, and yet it, and with it the feeling which is thereby expressed, became more and more common amongst the Pharisees and their successors. But if Hillel still distinguishes thus merely between the *common people* and the *religious*, by the school of Shammai the arrogant contrast between the *common people* and *the students of the Law* became prevalent, just as it is expressed in Greek, John vii. 49.

well;[1] *no one devoted too warmly to trade becomes wise. Yet where there are no men, endeavour to be a man.*[2]

The story was also told of him, that as he one day saw a skull floating upon the water, he called out to it, Because thou drownedst others, men drowned thee, but at last they that drowned thee will also be drowned.' The horror of unburied corpses which the ancients felt, had its share in producing this saying, which, moreover, was probably deemed worthy of subsequent repetition only because Hillel had once uttered it.

Of Shammai, the great opponent of Hillel, who subsequently found many more adherents than he, it was especially but one saying, or (according to the custom of these times) rather a short series of sayings, which was always being quoted;[3] so unproductive was he in spontaneous thoughts and telling words! His words are: *Make thy Thôra a compulsion to thyself*,[4] so that thou always readest in it and meditatest upon it at a set hour and forcest thyself thus to it and its teaching by the compulsion of the fixed hour! This thought, it cannot be denied, follows quite as a necessary consequence from the nature of Phariseeism when once it was adopted, and is very characteristic of the spirit and the self-discipline, or asceticism, of Shammai. In a similar spirit he adds, *speak little and do much*, which of itself admits of the most varied application, and is here probably intended simply to recommend Pharisaic punctilious activity, *but receive every man always with the look of a pleasant face!* not to appear in thy seriousness and punctiliousness too unfriendly to men—as if we saw here how Shammai, who was known for his rough strictness, desired to force himself as much as possible to live in kindly intercourse with his fellow-men. Certainly, after these memorial sayings, we cannot form a particularly high estimate of his mind and temper, still less can we feel

[1] We see here how Hillel is always seeking as a teacher to inculcate upon himself gentleness; it is less likely that he uttered the saying with a side-glance at Shammai.

[2] As if the saying were meant to express, that nevertheless one must not permit oneself to neglect one's duty on account of the weakness which shows itself everywhere among men.

[3] *P. Abôth*, i. 15.

[4] *Self-compulsion* (Germ. *selbstzwange*); the word קֶבַע can hardly be more concisely rendered. It signifies a *fixum*, *pensum*, the hour set apart for doing something together with the business which is thus compulsorily appointed; comp. the phrase *God* קוֹבֵעַ *fixeth for him the reward*, *P. Abôth*, iii. 2 [?]. But precisely because the above saying of Shammai, which generally exercised a predominant influence on the customs of later generations in religious things, nevertheless was not acceptable to at least some of the freer minds, Simeon, Gamaliel's son, said later, acc. ii. 13, *When thou prayest, make thy prayer not a* קֶבַע, a mere *pensum*, which has to be got over once for all at a fixed time in so many words; therefore an external compulsion.

an affection for him, while our esteem and regard for Hillel is increased.

3. Thus Hillel lived not merely like an ordinary Rabbi, just at the time when the Pharisees were ruling over the ancient community of Israel down to the destruction of Jerusalem; he must be called, by virtue of his great, gifted, and cultivated mind, the greatest of all Pharisees, and was, moreover, both the most universally respected, and, down to his advanced age, the most successful of them all. In him were embodied once more all the best attainments of which a Pharisee was capable; and as the Pharisees, of all the sects into which the nation was now more and more hopelessly divided, after all, remained the sect which was most able to lead the people, we may say that in Hillel may be most plainly perceived in what way even the best men of the last century before Christ, in Jerusalem itself and in its learned school, undertook to be the guides of the people of the true religion, and in what way they influenced their pupils and successors. For the closer consideration of this very point the present is the proper place. There are, however, but two aspects in which it must be especially looked at.

Hillel is primarily the head of a school and a student; it is before the learned studies of the time and the aims contemplated by them, that all its divisions are expected to disappear; and if a system of Biblical learning worthy of the name had at that time been already in existence, or had been effectually established by Hillel, that he was a Pharisee would have been a small thing in comparison with it. But according to all indications, his learned studies were precisely as that which they were mainly intended to be, and had necessarily to be, that is, as Biblical studies, in the highest degree imperfect. It is true, our historical sources are not sufficient to enable us to estimate them properly in every direction, for books have not come down from him as from Philo in the next century, and probably he wrote none. Still, we know with certainty that he started, and particularly as a teacher, from the search after and statement of general laws. He propounded first seven ultimate principles, in accordance with which the deduction of new precepts for life from the sacred Pentateuch and the rest of the Sacred Scriptures must be conducted.[1] They are essentially the same as those which were subsequently greatly enlarged in the schools of the teachers of the Law, and ever afterwards preserved in more subtle elaborations; and the rare art with which he

[1] The well-known seven מִדּוֹת; Wähner, in his *Antiquitates Ebræorum*, i. pp. 425 sq., describes what was ultimately made of these.

applied them, as an inventor of wholly new instruments, must have contributed in no small degree to the lustre which surrounded his labours as a teacher and legislator. But, without being expressly told, we may believe it of a man, who as a keen logician exercised such an original influence in his day, and founded such a powerful learned school, that he not only propounded logical laws for jurisprudence, but also proposed the nice and difficult questions regarding the boundaries, the number, and an ultimate connexion of all conceivable laws. And as at that time it was the custom to derive an almost endless number of old and new laws from the Scriptures, a mind like his might easily be led to ask, What is then the highest of all such laws? How he answered this question we have seen,[1] and we know from other sources[2] how popular the question remained for a considerable time, and how variously it was answered subsequently amongst the people.

However, if we look more closely at those seven highest principles of his, and the presupposition regarding the Scriptures from which he proceeded, we soon see to what a small extent even the basis of a thorough study of the Scriptures was supplied. Those seven principles are pure propositions of logic, resulting from the consideration of the course that can be adopted in accordance with the laws of pure thought when it is wished to draw conclusions from the words of a given book. But in this case the given book is taken as a basis simply as consisting of certain words and letters, as if it were allowable to draw from these alone all the conclusions which could be elicited from them by a skilful application of those pure laws of logic. What Scripture is and how it arose, remains in that case no less obscure than what meaning and purpose its various subject-matter originally possessed. Accordingly notwithstanding a logical process which is apparently so correct and so dazzling, there is nothing here but arbitrariness of a serious nature, precisely when the real difficulties of the matter are being approached, for the greatest difficulty for the Biblical studies of those days was after all in the end simply the question, how is the ancient sacred Book of Law, originally intended for very different conditions of life, now to be applied? As now Hillel was inclined by his personal disposition to mildness with reference to himself and all men, his greatest skill consists simply in evading the letter of Scripture by ingenious interpretations and subtle additions where its application appeared too harsh or too

[1] *Ante*, p. 23.

[2] From Matt. xxii. 35–40, and the parallel passages.

injurious and improbable for his contemporaries. The ancient Mosaic law, for instance, concerning the remission of debts every seventh year[1] was subsequent to the time of Ezra re-introduced,[2] but the desire to become rapidly rich, which had so greatly increased with the Greek rule, had long since frightened the rich from adhering conscientiously to that law, so that thereby all matters involving loans and debts had got into a state of serious insecurity. Accordingly Hillel hit upon the expedient that every creditor need on lending only cause a judicial declaration to be made, that he reserves to himself the right of reclaiming a certain debt from the person owing it at any time he chooses. As the Court of Justice was regarded in such matters as in the place of God, this agreement between debtor and creditor thus judicially confirmed was manifestly intended to render the law of the Scripture superfluous, although it was considered divine. And precisely this law has subsequently kept its place in the judicial life of the nation.[3] Nor in this particular instance would such an evasion produce any other than a good effect; however, how many other laws of Scripture could be similarly evaded merely because they appeared to be inconvenient and were not liked by many people! We shall immediately observe how little Hillel was able to avoid this danger.

With such proofs before us, we perceive that Hillel was least of all able to found on a firm basis that branch of study in particular upon which everything in this instance depended, that is, the study of the Bible; nor, in fact, could he as much as acquire a precise and accurate idea of its nature. In this respect he made no advance beyond his age, and we have no reason to suppose that in this study he excelled Philo, whose attainments on this head we are well acquainted with; although, as by birth an Aramean and as the head of a school in Jerusalem, he undoubtedly surpassed Philo as regards a mere knowledge of the Biblical languages. If he thus lacked

[1] See *Antiquities*, pp. 369 sq.

[2] See vol. v. p. 166.

[3] According to *M.* שביעית, x. 3–7. The fact that this law was always afterwards called by the Greek name פרוזבול, is one proof that it was from him. Instead of this strange term there exists also a more complete one, which is when taken alone still more unintelligible, viz., פרוסבולי ובוטי: probably a judicial document of this description began with the words *πρὸς βουλὴν ὑπῆλθε*, i.e., '*To the council* or the magistracy *entered* . . . . and declared,' etc, and it became customary to refer briefly to the document and the matter itself by these introductory words, as a consequence the words gradually got more and more abbreviated and unintelligible. The word אפוטרוף, i.e., *ἐπίτροπος*, for *guardian*, has also been preserved in the above law, x. 6. Subsequent to the rule of the Seleucidæ, Greek continued at the time of Hillel undoubtedly to be the language of the law courts, and probably remained so until the Roman war, a fact which is of considerable historical moment.

a satisfactory knowledge of the Bible, although he claimed especially to interpret and apply the Thôra, it follows that he was little able to meet the requirements of the higher objects which constituted the deepest purpose of his life. In fact, the consequence of this defect was that often mere ingenuity and a rapid adroitness of mind had to supply the place of the profounder knowledge, as some of the examples above given show. His whole temperament inclined him to indulge in witty pleasantry, and flashes of most brilliant acumen and of most subtle thought might well incessantly stream from his clever and gifted mind, enchanting his hearers and evoking a high reverence for the sacred Book from which such wisdom could be elicited; just as the same thing meets us again in the case of Philo. In addition to this, as a teacher of the Law he had a further field for the most inventive judgment and the intelligent penetration of a vast, often obscure, mass of subjects. At the same time a true and safe basis for more profound labours in getting to understand the serious ills under which the nation was suffering, and in promoting its lasting weal, had not at that time been supplied; and it was just this which he lacked.

So he remained a Pharisee; and if we ask what he accomplished as a Pharisee, it is correct to say that by his superior nature, his unwearied industry as a teacher, and his peculiar gentle kindness, he gave the most amiable form it was at all capable of to this sect, which became more and more predominant in the ancient community. Phariseeism, being from the very commencement of an eclectic nature, was capable of assuming at some time this form also; and nowhere could the benefits of this new form of a very pliant sect manifest themselves more brilliantly and beneficially than in the relations of this people to other nations. To Hillel before all others the Judean school of that time, and also in great part the Hagiocracy itself, which was then inseparable from it, owed the respect in which they were held by the potentates of the time and the comparatively long and prosperous peace as regards foreign powers in which they were able to live and work with but little interruption. Moreover, there was hardly another man who exerted a more beneficial influence than he upon the heathen more generally; and probably no one prior to the destruction of Jerusalem promoted so successfully the system of Proselytism.[1]

Still he could not put an end to the injurious eclecticism of

[1] Hence in those times the very short verb גִּיֵּר, *to make a proselyte of*, was formed.

Phariseeism; and scarcely had that form of it which was the mildest and kindliest it could possibly assume made its entrance into the world through him, when the exact opposite tendency, which was not less present in it from the first, made itself felt more strongly. The Pharisees claimed from the commencement, in opposition to the Sadducees, to be the more strictly Judean and patriotic; they desired to be regarded as the immediate stays of the Hagiocracy, and to influence the common people by the greatest possible religiousness of their public life. An inclination to a life of punctilious seriousness, and to a rigorous opposition to everything heathen, is therefore characteristic of them from their original bent; and scarcely had Hillel, by the peculiar force of his whole character and work, thrust this inclination somewhat into the background, when, through one of his own earliest and ablest pupils, it broke forth again with new vigour. This man was that *Shammai* who has been already so often referred to, at first the pupil and then the rival and indeed opponent of Hillel, who by his more rigid strictness and a nature generally of greater severity, attracted many, inasmuch as the fact could not be overlooked, that the original nature of Phariseeism found more consistent and thorough expression in him, and that Hillel in many respects really carried mildness and clemency too far, from mere good nature. Hillel on his part was, however, not simply thus good-natured, but also above everything astute enough to perceive the charges to which the seemingly or actually more rigid Pharisees exposed themselves, and to more deeply understand the detriment with which their procedure threatened the Judean commonwealth. So he remained true to himself, and the antithesis which was latent in the system of Phariseeism from the beginning soon came openly to the front.

It is true that as long as Hillel lived the schism remained as much as possible concealed; the gentleness and astuteness which were peculiarly his evinced themselves also in this particular in no small degree, and contentions which are supposed to proceed simply from a sacred Book and from learned studies may easily retire into the learned exercises and gymnastics of the school. The contention between Hillel and Shammai was accordingly regarded amongst the latter Rabbis simply as the model of a harmless and good dispute, indeed, as one conducted for the love of God.[1] But after the death of the great master the contention raged more unrestrainedly and loudly. The adherents of both sides separated from each other more dis-

[1] According to the saying *P. Abôth*, v. 17.

tinctly, gave very different decisions on many weighty questions, and made no concealment of the important differences which separated them. These differences were, however, necessarily of a twofold kind in general.

As regards the internal life of the school and community, Shammai's opposite tendencies showed themselves to be to some extent really quite warranted and of good influence, in as far as Hillel, and still more many of his adherents, were too ready with their explanations of the duties which were prescribed in the Thôra, and thereby exposed themselves to the danger of even defending thoughtless and easy morals. Most famous in this respect was the contention as to divorce, which *the house*, i.e., the school, of *Hillel* made as easy as possible, while *the house of Shammai* made it difficult, in doing which both contended with each other most hotly regarding the proper interpretation of two little words of the Law,[1] while they were not capable of properly settling even this verbal difference.

But as regards the relations externally towards other people than their own, Shammai's harsh nature naturally led to constant friction with those in power and to war with the heathen; and from the incident referred to previously,[2] we see how greatly Shammai inclined, at all events in his earlier days, in this direction. Subsequently he became, even in this aspect of his character, less impetuous, so that his closest adherents followed him in this also, and both *houses*, i.e., schools, remained in so far without reproach. Nevertheless, it is evident that it was from this school that the new one of the Gaulonite Judas, which has to be described at length below, proceeded, simply by a process of consistent, logical development. That later school led at once, from the commencement of this new Roman period, to the most hazardous friction, and finally to the destruction of Jerusalem itself, as also undoubtedly most of the opponents of the Apostle Paul proceeded from it.[3]

The new opposition to the Gaulonite or Zealots' school, which was common to both, might, after the commencement of the immediate rule of Rome over Jerusalem, have caused the two *houses* to again draw somewhat nearer together and checked the outbreak of their open schism; but their deeper opposition to each other did not cease, although it took, in the case of in-

[1] The words עֶרְוַת דָּבָר, Deut. xxiv. 1. The contention is referred to only at the end of the *Massekheth Gittîn*, ix. 10, as if unwillingly; and it may be seen in the Babylonian *Gemâra* how foolishly the two houses contended as to the interpretation of the words.

[2] *Ante*, p. 16.

[3] See vol. vi. pp. 429 sq. [German].

dividual teachers, very different forms, according to times and places. It was part of the logical outcome of the Pharisaic system that *the house of Shammai* grew more and more predominant; still the unrivalled mildness of Hillel and the lustre which he had thrown over Judeanism remained all along too fresh in the memory to leave him for a long time to come without his admirers; and if the Gamaliel of the New Testament was really, as ancient tradition said, Hillel's grandson, he had inherited and perpetuated much of that rare union of astuteness and mildness which is the characteristic feature of the mind of Hillel.[1] But even if both schools, during the last half-century before the destruction of Jerusalem, sought to hide their internal contentions, the entire Pharisaic system had notwithstanding been so pronouncedly developed, and mainly by the results of Hillel's labours, that sentence could already be competently passed upon it by Christ. And if then, in consequence of the sway of the Zealots, which led to the dissolution of the kingdom, the divisions of the two schools were completely silenced for the moment, they came again, after the destruction of Jerusalem, all the more freely to the front in the endeavour to re-establish the Hagiocracy, but this time with wholly new aims and in wholly new combinations.[2] The change in the latter was so great that the famous Rabbi *'Aqîba*,[3] notwithstanding that he was the most uncompromising enemy of the Romans, admitted in the question of divorce a yet greater licence than Hillel;[4] and similar contradictions appeared at that time in other matters, inasmuch as they adhered from the very first to the hybrid nature of Phariseeism. Thus the last remnants of the school of Hillel were gradually disintegrated and dissipated; and the labours of this greatest and best of all Pharisees remained without any good and lasting results.

The history of Hillel and his school is in this way, in the first instance, most instructive as a means of enabling us properly to understand the nature of Phariseeism in its profoundest moving impulses and its general development as regarded from its highest summit. But for all times and nations also it supplies the best illustration of the eternal lesson, that in the case of any age and community, excellent general principles, even in the hands of the best teachers and leaders, are by no means all that is required, but that the difficult questions which present themselves to an age must be always thoroughly examined and

[1] Vol. vi. pp. 185 sq., 231 sq. [Germ.].
[2] Vol. vii. pp. 43, 50 sq. [German].
[3] Vol. vii. p. 340.
[4] *M. Gittîn*, ix. x.

mastered by the aid of the most exact knowledge, and that in this way the real removal of the evils from which the age suffers must be attempted with the most unwearied toil.[1]

THE FIRST OF THE THREE FINAL STAGES OF THE HISTORY OF THE NATION.

The First Thirty Years of the Roman Rule in Palestine: from the Year 7 to 37 A.D.

1. *The Romans in Jerusalem and Samaria.*

Augustus resolved not to leave the country, which was without a governor, as a province to the Roman Senate, that it might appoint a proconsul, or a proprætor, as governor, but to administer the province directly, like all the less peaceful provinces lying on the confines of the empire, particularly Syria, and to send to it immediately from himself the governors (as *Legati*). As the country when it became better known to the Romans was connected with Syria and was therefore regarded historically and geographically as belonging to it, it might also very well have been put under the Governor of Syria, who already ruled over such a wide territory. But, on the other hand, it had now long been known to Rome as a country too restless and too peculiar to make it advisable to connect it without any independence simply with a neighbouring province. Accordingly it received a governor of its own with the name of *Procurator*,[2] to whom the full authority of a *Prætor* was given, particularly also the power of capital punishment. At the same time, he, with his few Roman soldiers, and accordingly in all matters connected with war, was unconditionally subordinated to the Proconsul (or rather *Præses*, also *Rector*) of Syria. The latter had, when appealed to, to furnish him with military

[1] How fundamentally wrong it is seriously to compare this Hillel with Christ follows from all that has been above said. Hillel was a good man, but, even as compared with the prophets of the Old Testament, he was not very strong and independent. The exaggerations which the later Rabbinical writers are guilty of in their stories about him have been passed over in the above chapter, but all that is significant, or even more than usually difficult to understand, has received greater attention. The article in the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* x. appears here with additions.

[2] Ἐπίτροπος, called also more generally in the New Testament and often in Josephus ἡγεμών, in Luther's version *landpfleger* [Authorised Version, *governor*]. When Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 1, 9, 1, designates the land as regards its relation to Rome not a hyparchy but an *eparchy*, this is so far correct as it was only remotely placed under the Syrian proconsul, and its governor received more than ordinary independence. He likewise calls the governor ἔπαρχος, *Antiq.* xviii. 2. 2; but Philo (*Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxxviii.) uses ὕπαρχος.

assistance, and could also in extreme cases supervise his whole conduct, hear in the first instance the complaints which his subjects made against him, in order to report regarding them to the emperor, and might even send him to Rome to answer for himself if upon such complaints he was deemed guilty. The Syrian Governor, on the other hand, was a military commander like few others in his time, and always had his four legions in readiness. But in that the land was thus to a certain degree subordinated to the extremely large province of Syria, the Romans simply restored the foreign relations which they found existing when they first became acquainted with it and first meddled with its position as regards other powers. The Romans took the place of the Syrian supremacy, and were able to exercise all the sovereign rights which the Syrian kings had formerly either exercised without dispute or laid claim to; and once more the Seleucid Antioch became, as the usual seat of the Syrian Proconsuls, of great importance for Palestine. And the arrangements which Augustus made in this respect were always regarded on the whole as directions for his successors.

As, moreover, with the Roman rule the right of conquest claimed by the house of Herod over Samaria now ceased, and the Samaritans had constantly demanded in Rome their independence of Jerusalem again, it was fully granted to them; and the Roman Governor thus came to administer two provinces which were independent of each other and each of which obeyed its own special laws. But it was Idumea that remained connected with Judea, in accordance with the history of the last two centuries:[1] consequently Judea was the larger of the two provinces.

The Governor (for we will call him by this name for the future) was ordered by the Emperor to take up his residence in Cæsarea on the Mediterranean, the same new port which Herod had just built and populated with such uncommon care and at such a great expense, as he hoped to the fame and lasting advantage of himself and his dynasty.[2] So soon did all the best plans of this house turn against it! The Governor accordingly resided at a considerable distance from Samaria and still further from Jerusalem; but from that fact he remained in closer connection with Rome and Antioch, while it could give him little pleasure by dwelling in Jerusalem to stand constantly in close contact with

[1] See Mark iii. 8, and the remarks thereon below. But the limits of Idumea to the south, in the direction of the Arabian rule at the time, deserve special examination.

[2] See vol. v. pp. 430 sq.

the singular people he had to rule. Moreover, had Jerusalem been chosen, Samaria would have put forward equal claims to the right of being a capital. In Cæsarea accordingly the Roman garrison appointed for the country had also its stationary head-quarters; and the city, by means of its extensive commerce and trade, now flourished even more rapidly than under its founder Herod, especially inasmuch as heathen in ever larger numbers settled around this seat of the Governor.[1] However, the entire Roman garrison was not great: not so much as a whole legion, with all the instruments of war which are part of it, was originally destined for Palestine. And if the conflicts are called to mind which arose somewhat early over the simple matter of the march of Roman soldiers with the Imperial eagles and standards[2] through the sacred city, their absence appears to have belonged to the original conditions of the province.

In Jerusalem, where now again, after the removal of the national princes, the Synedrion could move more freely, the privileges previously mentioned,[3] e.g. the right of asylum, the complete inviolability of the great Sanctuary, which Antiochus the Great and other kings had once granted to the city, were without doubt brought into greater prominence once more. Even from the earliest times of the second Jerusalem this endeavour of the Hagiocracy to enlarge the privileges of the city had been making constant advances. It was sought to maintain in view of the heathen rulers the inviolable sanctity, first of all, of the Temple, next of the whole city of Jerusalem, then of the largest possible district around the latter, and to ward off everything which seemed to violate that sanctity.[4] The undisturbed perpetuation of the true religion really appeared in those centuries necessarily to depend upon local limitations; although Jerusalem as a sacred city thereby became in the end only similar to those numerous heathen cities which likewise laid claim to a certain sacred territory as seats of their peculiar deities. The Temple-watch therefore was always to be entrusted to Levites; elsewhere in Jerusalem also the pre-

[1] See particularly Tac. *Hist.* ii. 79; Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 7; 14. 4 sq.; *Ant.* xix. 9. 1; xx. 8. 7. The city was accordingly for the most part of pronounced heathenish tendencies.

[2] See below.

[3] Vol. v. p. 284, and elsewhere.

[4] As in these times it was the custom to reduce everything sacred and pertaining to law to round numbers, so an accurate gradation of the sanctity of locality and distance from the Holy of Holies was thought out with immense pains. In the time of Josephus a sevenfold gradation of this kind had long been distinguished. (See *Antiquities of Israel*, p. 331.) A tenfold gradation is mentioned *M* כֵּלִים, i. 6–9, and it is instructive to compare the two gradations.

sence of armed foreigners was not liked; and as a permanent force only the absolutely necessary Roman soldiers seem to have had small quarters in the castle Antonia. But on feast-days, when great crowds of people collected in the city, and on that account alone disturbances might always be feared, the Governor often went with a suitable number of soldiers to the city, and at the same time probably always attended to various kinds of business which had waited for the occasion, and particularly to that which belonged to him as the supreme judicial authority. On such occasions he took up his residence in the *Prætorium*, which was then so called in Greek also,[1] that is, the palace of Herod previously described,[2] which was now converted into the court of the Governor, and accordingly also into the supreme court of justice.[3] He delivered judgment from the elevated judges' throne placed upon a projection of the house, ornamented with beautiful marble; the trials took place in an inner court.[4] A single cohort appears to have had always its head-quarters in Jerusalem; another in Samaria, which, however, probably always retired to Jerusalem for its winter-quarters, in order to be at hand particularly at the Passover.[5] In Cæsarea the largest number of the Roman soldiers was usually encamped.

The Governor had really royal prerogatives, and in matters of supreme authority he took the place of the former kings.[6] He had therefore also the right of appointing and removing the high-priest: with regard to which right Herod had already left him such decided precedents. Even the jealousy of possible abuse of the hierarchical office was retained by the first Governors from the previous kings, as appears particularly from the following indication. The high-priest could perform official duties in the Sanctuary itself only in the ancient sacred garments,[7]

[1] In this particular also the second Gospel shows that it is the oldest; since, in spite of its preference for Latin words, it says more explicitly, '*the court which is Prætorion*,' xv. 16; in Matt. and John it is always briefly 'the Prætorion.'

[2] Vol. v. pp. 434 sq.

[3] At least this can be inferred from the words in the narrative of Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xxxviii. It is true that for Herod's heirs on their visits to Jerusalem a palace must always have been in readiness (as Luke xxiii. 7, and other instances mentioned in vol. vi. [German]); but probably that was only a wing of the great building.

[4] This is most plainly described in the Gospel of John, ch. xviii. xix.

[5] This follows with great probability from Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 1, at the beginning, if we read with the ancient Latin translation *Samaria* instead of Cæsarea; for it is improbable that the whole army withdrew from Cæsarea to Jerusalem into its winter-quarters. Further, comp. *Ant.* xx. 5. 3.

[6] When it is said in passages of the Talmud, that the right of life and death was taken from the Synedrion forty years before the destruction of the Temple, it is easy to understand that this round number rests simply upon a general reminiscence of a later generation.

[7] See *Antiquities*, p. 292.

a usage which was the more scrupulously insisted upon in these later centuries in proportion as this costume was now found prescribed even in the sacred Book. When the Asmoneans assumed the office, they undoubtedly also procured afresh the costly attire suited to it, which the high-priest, save on exceptional occasions, had been obliged to put on only on the three principal annual feasts and the annual fast-day; and John Hyrcanus, in whom the power of the Asmoneans reached its summit, caused his sacred garments, together with his other precious things, to be kept carefully locked up in the castle, which was then called *Baris*,[1] i.e. simply *castle*, but later Antonia, close to the Temple. His descendants followed his example, but Herod and Archelaus, as lords of the castle and the kingdom, on the other hand, found therein a means of strengthening their power. They left the sacred attire of the high-priest, as well as all other objects and usages regarded as sacred, in all honour, committed the care of them to special priests and custodians; indeed they caused a light to be kindled daily by the warder of the castle in the dark chamber where they were locked up and sealed. But they always gave them out only a week previous to the day when they were to be used, and had to be afresh put in order and consecrated for this purpose, and they took them into charge again on the day after the feast. Thereby it was in their power to exclude a high-priest who was not acceptable to them. This nervous precaution was now observed by the Romans also, and it will subsequently appear that, notwithstanding an attempt to permit greater freedom in this respect, they nevertheless abandoned it for the traditional jealousy.[2] For it was really an instrument and a mark of their supremacy and of the unity of their power, which was obliged to be maintained in spite of the Hagiocracy.

Of the actual regal appearance and majesty of the distant *Cæsar*, people in Palestine got no distinct and vivid impression at all. Simply the presence of the Governor, the Roman soldiers, the taxes, and the coins constantly reminded them of him. Prayers and sacrifices were also offered for him as formerly for the Persian kings,[3] both the ordinary sacrifices[4] and particularly magnificent ones on special occasions.[5] However, it would be

[1] Vol. v. 112 sq., 382, 386.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4. 3, comp. xx. 1. 1 sq.

[3] V. p. 114.

[4] Comp. Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10. 4; i. 17. 2, Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxiii. It appears from this that this sacrifice for the foreign government was connected with the daily, morning and evening sacrifice (comp. *Antiquities*, p. 130); and it will be shown below (vol. vi. [German]) that it was really regarded as no less a mark of the existing Imperial supremacy than the coins.

[5] Acc. to Philo's *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xlv.

wrong to think of a Roman Governor of the ordinary type as nothing more than a stern, reserved potentate, not at all open to representation and remonstrance. These Roman rulers could not so easily forget that the times of the Republic were not so long gone by; in the case of these Roman potentates, not less than in the case of their Greek predecessors in Macedonian times, there remained still too fresh a memory of the freedom of citizens from which they themselves had sprung; and we therefore often find them engaged even in very familiar conference and lively exchange of words with their subjects.[1] Moreover, they were responsible to the Emperors as regards everything, and complaint and accusation could always be lodged against them at Rome: neither was Augustus, or Tiberius, inclined to wink at their shortcomings. Still, their actual power was, after all, on account of their distance from the Cæsar, sufficiently decisive and terrible.

On the other hand, in the inferior courts of justice and magistracies no less than the Synedrion, somewhat greater freedom of movement was possible than under the Idumeans, since the Romans, like the Persians formerly, were satisfied to have the supreme power, and did not on principle desire to interfere with the peculiar customs and institutions of the people. The schools of law and mental movements which had so greatly flourished under Herod's heavy hand, precisely because they had been looked upon as a last refuge from this oppression, were not put under restraint by the Romans, and developed themselves according to their own inward impulses without any disturbance whatever. The Synedrion was therefore unrestrained also in all its regulations and determinations in religious matters: simply the ratification of all capital sentences was reserved to the Governor; yet it had authority forthwith to cut down anyone without exception, even were he a Roman, who attempted by force to go beyond the confines of the inner sanctuary.[2] The other courts of justice were very busy at that time, according to all indications, and in general working neither inequitably nor injuriously, especially as it was known how much importance the Emperors, and particularly Tiberius, attached to a strict administration of justice.[3] It will appear below that in Samaria a council of elders, or a council of the people, now again had freer action.

[1] As may be plainly seen not only from the New Testament but also from Philo's *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxxviii.

[2] According to Jos. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 2. 4.

[3] Comp. such allusions as Matt. v. 21-26; Luke xviii. 2-6. The prosperity of the schools of law after the destruction of Jerusalem also presupposes a corresponding prosperity at this time.

In the matter of taxation, however, including both the customs and the tribute, the country received perhaps a temporary (see below) but no permanent relief: a point as to which the capital particularly complained, which, as the great holy city, imagined it could with less difficulty be freed from various taxes. The taxes consisted, as far as we can at present see, of the property tax, in the two forms of a capitation and land tax;[1] of a duty on houses;[2] of a duty on market-produce,[3] and the other custom-duties. In addition the old sacred capitation tax, now reckoned at two drachmas, remained for the Temple unaltered, which was undoubtedly constantly collected by officers of the priests, and could be now regarded more as a voluntary tax[4] as the Romans did not trouble themselves about it. However, owing to the prevailing preference for the Hagiocracy, this tax, as well as others which were now derived from the sacred Book of Law, was generally very willingly paid. The details can no longer be quite accurately discerned; it is certain that as early as the beginning of the reign of Tiberius complaints of oppressive taxation from 'Syria and Judea' had made themselves heard at the Roman court, and that Tiberius did not remain quite indifferent to them.[5]

But, after all, the greatest difficulty for the Roman government lay in the profound incompatibility of the Hagiocracy with every other form of government. This incompatibility had formerly shown itself by the most various signs; and now, after the Hagiocracy had been developed in such a high degree, it was destined again to make itself still more plainly felt. It might in a troubled time perhaps yield to the strong pressure from without; but from the most hidden depths of the nation's heart, in which the Hagiocracy had only just struck root most deeply, the force of the opposition to the oppression of a foreign rule gradually assumed increased magnitude again. Thus tendencies which had first in the Persian and then in the Greek period developed slowly, produced now their effect all the more rapidly even against the terrible power of Rome, although during these thirty years they were from the very first more repressed, and so forcibly restrained that they were as yet unable to show themselves openly.

[1] The *census*, Matt. xxii. 17, 19 (Mark xii. 14); xvii. 25.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 6. 3.

[3] *Ibid.* xviii. 4. 3, where it is called τέλη τῶν ὠνουμένων καρπῶν. It also, however, occurs earlier, *Ant.* xv. 9. 1; and consisted, probably, of the *centesima rerum venalium*, acc. Tac. *Ann.* i. 78.

[4] See, with regard to it, *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 342 sq., and Jos. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6.

[5] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 42.

The Census and the Publicans. Judas the Gaulonite.

For in the trying time of transition into this new order of things, the whole fatal schism was destined to show itself in the case of a momentous occurrence. The schism lay here concealed, prepared for by all the past history of the nation, and already involved in it the greatest possible disaster; indeed, already appeared as the proper commencement of the final close of the entire history of the people as it was here from the first threatened.

In order to settle some matters which had at once to be attended to, and were particularly important and difficult, and to show to the new Province who was to be its supreme Governor, in addition to the Roman knight appointed as its provincial Governor, Augustus despatched the Proconsul P. Sulpicius Quirinius,[1] who was appointed at the same time in Syria as the superior Governor, and went thence into Palestine. This P. Quirinius, a man of unknown descent and of little conscientiousness, but of most active zeal in the service of Augustus and subsequently Tiberius, died at Rome[2] as an old man, in the year 21 A.D., with the reputation for covetousness, love of power, and excessive subserviency towards his imperial masters. He had, previous to his Syrian appointment, been in various ways occupied in the Roman East with imperial commissions, as he was subsequently also employed there a good deal.[3] It was on this occasion especially his duty to confiscate for the Emperor, and send to Rome, treasures which had been partly inherited and partly amassed by the exiled national prince, Archelaus—a commission which he executed quickly and successfully. But he had further to make the census of the newly-acquired country, in order to state accurately to the Emperor what taxes it could furnish yearly according to its population, its fields, and its other circumstances: until this *census* had been taken, the various affairs of the country could not be definitely arranged.

[1] What Josephus narrates (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 1; 17. 8; vii. 8. 1) he has subsequently (*Ant.* xvii. *ad fin.*; xviii. 1. 1; 2. 1) narrated much more accurately, and as if correcting himself. The orthography *Quirinus* is, according to best original documents, inferior.

[2] According to the indications in Tac. *Ann.* iii. 48, comp. with ii. 30, iii. 22 sq.; what Strabo, *Geog.* xvi. 6. 5, briefly mentions of his heroic deeds in Cilicia, also says little for him.

[3] It appears also, from the fact that Tacitus says not a single word about this important mission to Palestine, how little he intended (*Ann.* iii. 48) to mention all the commissions and transactions which he executed in the East. We can therefore make no unfavourable inferences from Tacitus as to the census of which the Gospels speak.

This census is also memorable from the fact that it is associated with another, which was taken, according to the third Gospel, shortly before the birth of Christ. As long as Herod lived, the Romans were unable to undertake such an assessment of the country as they now proposed as its complete masters; and if they had then carried out such a complete assessment, the present one would have been almost superfluous, and would, moreover, scarcely have produced the great commotions of which we shall speak immediately. Besides, that census in the earlier book, from which Luke received it into his Gospel, is recorded and connected with Christ's history only in very general expressions. The narrative in the present Gospel of Matthew still remains without this connection,[1] and it is Luke, as the last compiler and reviser of the original sources of his Gospel, who first makes it. But Luke does not refer the census mentioned in his authorities to our P. Quirinius: all that he does in connection with that census is to point to the later one, undertaken under Quirinius, as that which was in any case better known.[2] For, commonly, when the census was simply mentioned, it was that one we are now considering which was intended,[3] which coincided with a totally new order of things, was the sign of the commencement of the immediate Roman rule itself, and, moreover, remained particularly firmly fixed in the memory of the later generations through the events which are to be mentioned directly. Now, as between both censuses only an interval of some ten years had elapsed, and as the time when Herod died bears a great similarity with that under consideration as regards the interference of the Romans and the internal commotion in the country, it might be conjectured that perhaps the census intended in Luke's authority was really the one before us, and that the two different periods had simply been confounded in subsequent tradition. We shall consider this further below, but must, however, at once remark here, that the narrative in Luke, regarding the time of the birth of Christ, does not refer to a valuation of the Holy Land alone like this we are dealing with, but to a general census of the whole Roman empire, with its indirect and direct possessions, which, therefore, could be taken less rigorously in the case of the merely vassal-countries.[4] And as P. Quirinius had previously been

[1] See below.

[2] This follows from a proper insight into the sources of our Gospels. See my work *Ueber die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. p. 232 sq., and the additional remarks below.

[3] As appears from Luke himself Acts v. 37.

[4] See on this point further the above work, *Ueber die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. p. 234.

employed for all kinds of imperial business in Syria and elsewhere in the East, he must have seemed the more suitable for conducting this census.

The census, as it was now taken in hand in the name of the Emperor, as the sole lord and king of the country, was no mere enumeration of the population, but a valuation of property,[1] with a view to a more accurate determination of the Roman taxes. It became thus the first sign, which everybody, including the meanest man, could at once understand, that Rome had taken possession of the land. It is true those men in the country who had desired the direct rule of Rome, were from the first able to foresee this; but they were only the majority of the richer men, and particularly those who expected their salvation from undisturbed trade and commerce, who looked with more or less indifference upon religion, government, law, and constitution. But there had then long been in Jerusalem a powerful party which thought quite otherwise and had wholly different aims. This is the party sufficiently characterised previously.[2] From the time of Ezra this party had always, amid the changing times, again and again revived from weakness and threatening dissolution to fresh life, because at its heart was an element of imperishable truth. And yet on each change of the times and recovery of new life the party had in the end always become simply more unhealthy and more injurious in its influence; and this is the case again on this most recent change. It could not be otherwise, because from the very first, together with the truth, there was at its heart also an equally great untruth, and it still continued always unable even to understand, to say nothing of seizing and holding fast, that one true and proper thing which must now come as the necessary sequel of the whole development of Israel's history. This is the spirit of the Hagiocracy in Israel, as it had now through several centuries grown more conscious of itself and more firmly developed, and now for the first time unfolded its necessary logical consequences.

If the Holy Scriptures, and of these again particularly that one book alone which forms their basis—the Pentateuch—are to be regarded as absolutely holy, and by implication therefore all existing institutions and customs partake likewise of the exalted lustre and the revered inviolability of this holiness only in so far as they repose upon that basis, it then follows naturally that everything which that Holy Book prescribes possesses pro-

[1] *ἀπογράφεσθαι τὰς οὐσίας*, or *ἀποτιμᾶσθαι τοὺς βίους*, it is called expressly, in the more complete details of Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 1.

[2] Vol. v. *passim*.

perly equal validity, and if that is as yet not the case it must then at least be striven after with the deepest conviction, and with unfaltering effort. Now, the only form of the true religion which is prescribed and glorified in the Pentateuch is that which this religion assumed at its first introduction into the world, and which existed by law during the first of the three great phases of the history of the people. This form, it is true, possesses the most primitive force and logical necessity of any which the true religion could assume on its appearance in the world; but it was mutable, like every external form. In fact, it had already passed through such a vast history and transformation, that it lived now in its completeness only within the covers of the Holy Book. Moreover, this form had the less right to claim to be regarded as the sole, highest, and eternal model in proportion as it was certain that the religion, the earliest aims and first energies of which had taken outward shape in it, although the immovable foundation of all true religion was nevertheless not the perfect religion itself. When, therefore, the Hagiocracy, as has been discussed at length,[1] took more definite shape, particularly under the hand of Ezra, having itself proceeded from the two antitheses of the most burning zeal for true religion and of the continued absence of the consummated true one, such passages of the Pentateuch as were not compatible with the existing supremacy of the heathen were then at first left alone. This was the case particularly with the demands of a strictly self-contained kingdom of Jahveh, of the rule of His people throughout Canaan, of a high-priesthood with the exclusion of any regular human lord and king; for the reason that it was darkly felt that they were not applicable in a world which had been so greatly changed. But according to the sense of the Holy Book the demand of these things itself remained in force. And the more zealously, under the oppressive and rent condition of the present, men clung as time went on to the Holy Book and the old memories of a noble past, the more their minds again entered deeply into the true meaning of the Holy Book; and the more the changes of the times brought its demands home to them as necessary, or even as more practicable, with so much the greater courage many dared to think of their fulfilment, and with so much the greater strength did that which lay latent at the lowest basis of this Hagiocracy tend to reveal and perfect itself. Men grew tired of the Persian rule; threw themselves boldly into the

[1] See vol. v. *passim*.

Grecian freedom, but with the growing claim, that this freedom should particularly assist the 'people of God' in the development of the institutions and stays of the Hagiocracy. From the moral corruption of Grecian tendencies the 'Pious' rescued themselves before it was too late, fought under the Asmoneans for the true religion, but in the form of the Hagiocracy, and submitted to their rule as long as they simply sought to attain the high-priesthood. The final victory witnessed the Pharisees springing from it as the true and perfect flower of the Hagiocracy. But great as was the worldly wisdom with which the majority of the Pharisees sought to maintain the victory, there arose from precisely this moment onwards, partly within and partly without their ranks, a new party, which conceived in a more earnest and logical spirit the demands based upon the Holy Book, as regards the constitution and outward form of the true religion. This party put forward the 'Theocracy' as the only lawful form of government in Israel, and suspected and opposed every princely, royal, and even every foreign heathen, power. These are the voices which made themselves heard at first against John Hyrcanus only here and there, and then in larger numbers against Alexander Jannæus;[1] and though they were reduced to silence by the latter, they grew loud again as soon as Pompey approached the city as a conqueror and umpire.[2] As the adherents of this party, occupying a place between Pharisees and Sadducees, were as yet unable properly to make their way, without doubt many of them joined the remnants of the Asmoneans in the conflicts of that time with the Romans. They were then kept down most rigorously by Herod, but threw themselves during his long reign with all the greater zeal into the study of the Law, which just at that time greatly flourished, and then, shortly before his death, showed by a rising,[3] suppressed by sanguinary means, what unexpected daring of soul they were able to draw from this study even, and with what enthusiasm they could inspire the noblest of the youth. After Herod's death many of them took part without doubt in the destructive risings which were continued into the reign of Archelaus.[4]

But now this unpopular prince had quickly fallen. At last it seemed possible that Jerusalem should be able to get rid of all human princes and kings. If instead of that the immediate Roman rule was proclaimed over the Holy Land, and it was commenced with the census, which was further suspected for

[1] See vol. v. pp. 382, 388 sq.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 398 sq.
[3] See *Ibid.* pp. 448 sq.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 452 sq.

peculiar reasons, then a spark fell into regions which had long been hot almost to combustion. The fact that the other party, who from mere indolent love of repose had desired the presence of the Romans, had anxiously dreaded such an outbreak, and that the internal relations generally were greatly strained, rendered such a combustion all the more unavoidable. A direct heathen rule had been almost unheard of in the Holy Land after the times of the Maccabees; and although the Herods had done no more than preserve the appearance of a native government, men now saw a heathen rule extending without any concealment over the sacred soil. Moreover, the census, even in its milder forms disliked by the nation from early times,[1] seemed, as it was now undertaken with great rigour directly by the heathen, and when new taxes were to be paid to the emperor, to contradict the express command of the Holy Book, inasmuch as it recognises taxes for the Sanctuary only.[2] Accordingly a Levite, Judas of Gamala on the further shore of the Lake of Galilee, usually called *the Gaulonite*,[3] from the district in which Gamala lies, supported by a Pharisee Saddok,[4] placed himself at the head of the discontented. Both were manifestly in their time highly respected men; but the thing which specially assisted their cause was the more thorough substantiation of their view by their learned studies and a religion derived from the living spirit of the Holy Scriptures. We see from this fact how greatly at that time the study of the Scriptures, in conjunction with philosophy, which had so vigorously prospered during the long reign of Herod in spite of much external oppression, still flourished. 'It is indeed allowable in the quiet possession of wealth to acquire still greater wealth, but better than this is that good the securing of which will bring the glory and fame of magnanimity.' And again, 'God does not assist to a successful issue except when the resolutions of men co-operate, particularly if, when there is the firm resolve in the mind to accomplish great things, there is not wanting the required toil.'[5]

[1] See vol. iii. pp. 160 sq.; comp. *Antiquities*, pp. 304 sq.

[2] See *Antiquities*, pp. 303 sq.

[3] Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 1; 17. 8; *Ant.* xx. 5. 2 he is called a Galilean, but the more correct statement is obviously to be found in the passage which generally treats of him with greatest accuracy—*Ant.* xviii. 1. 1; although here also (1. 6) the surname *Galilean* recurs. In ordinary life he might in Jerusalem be really called a Galilean—i.e. one coming from the North—without much closer definition. He was probably quite a different person from the Galilean Judas mentioned vol. v. p. 453.

[4] For similar reasons there is not much mention of either him or the Gaulonite in the Talmudic writings; yet, at all events, his name has been preserved as one of the pupils of Shammai, *Gem.* יבמות, fol. 15 *b*; and we have seen pp. 9 sq. how well this may have been the case.

[5] In W. Dindorf's edition of Josephus (Paris, 1845–47), instead of παρέσχον the

Relying upon such views of life and duty, and models to all in their cool contempt of death, they urged the most fiery spirits to win freedom, and taught that the Roman census could only bring the plainest slavery. God, they said, is the sole leader and lord, and it is a sin to call any man whatsoever lord and to acknowledge the rule of mortals.

Hereby a view and endeavour, which lay hidden at the deepest basis of this Hagiocracy, and which required only favouring times for their logical development, had at last attained clearness and certainty both in doctrine and practice. It was no mere ephemeral and evanescent endeavour which now, in conjunction with the last great advance, as respects foreign relations, of the entire historical development of Israel, made its appearance and came into immediate collision with the direct rule of Rome. This party germinated and blossomed forth from the whole past inner development of the national life, if the great defects which adhere to the latter are overlooked, with logical sequence as the only development which could still produce living offshoots. The previous great and serious divisions in the heart of the nation were thereby, it is true, simply increased by one more, and the domestic confusion was only made still worse. Josephus on one occasion properly calls the views of this party the *fourth* philosophy of the Judeans;[1] and if he mentions that its adherents differed otherwise but little from the Pharisees, that is only in so far correct as they, not less than the Pharisees originally, proceeded generally from the more serious party of the people which was disinclined to heathenism, and also, like the Pharisees, interested themselves especially in public affairs and were ambitious of government. But in point of earnestness, thoroughness, and contempt of death, they immeasurably surpassed the Pharisees, and from this time separated themselves from them outwardly also decidedly enough, and indeed, gradually became their most bitter enemies. The Hagiocracy, seeking generally to go back from this late present into the oldest and, as they were deemed, the most sacred circumstances of the Theocracy, endeavoured in this school to go right back at last with complete earnestness and logical consistency into the very origin of

reading παρασχόν, in the passage *Ant.* xviii. 1. 1, is correctly adopted; but the meaning of the words is, through a fresh incorrect reading, improperly fixed. The reading σφαλεῖσι instead of ἀσφάλισιν, which Immanuel Bekker also now prefers, hardly yields a good meaning.—The view of the teachers of the law who arose shortly before the death of Herod is established in a very similar way in Jos. *Bell. Jud.* i. 33. 2; *Ant.* xvii. 6. 2, 3.

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 1. 1, *ad fin.*; comp. vol. v. pp. 365 sq.

the history of the community of the true God, and to restore the Theocracy with the same purity, the same exclusiveness, and the same power in which, according to the Holy Book and the dim reminiscences of the time, it had existed in that primitive age when it originated.

It is true that, as the times had now shaped themselves, a host of insurmountable difficulties opposed the carrying out of this endeavour in detail. And, as if half-conscious of their own inability to overcome the resistance of the cold world, notwithstanding their own enthusiastic views and determined resolution, the school soon taught not only that every form of self-sacrifice and contempt of death was a duty, but defended also the secret *Fehme*, even as against the best friends and relatives, if they appeared to stand in the way of the sacred aims of this conspiracy. The part which the Qarmathians and the emissaries of the Old Man of the Mountain played in early Mohammedanism, and which was played also in our days by the ecclesiastical and political revolutionists, was represented at the close of the history of Israel by the fiery *Zealots* of this party. But upon the foundations which had once been furnished, and which as yet had not been made insecure by the substitution of anything better, they were thoroughly logical, daring, and tenacious. They did not lack, even in the keenest contest, the culture of philosophy required to defend their positions. And their aim was one which must have appeared in itself as exceedingly glorious and necessary. Wherefore all the existing powers of the world were no longer of any avail against these Zealots. They were able to smile under the worst sufferings and punishments, defying death in every form. Scarcely had they been for a time swept from the surface, when they rose up again at the first favourable moment, as from beneath the ground, and from their innumerable hiding-places in Palestine, which were so difficult to destroy owing to the peculiar nature of the country. Henceforth they determined more decisively than any other party the events which were for the moment most prominent in the last great stage of the history of Israel. And while the energies of the earlier parties relaxed, they really still fought quite alone upon this field with utmost resolution, to determine whether the ancient true religion or heathenism was to rule the world; inasmuch as they had a dim yet tolerably decided foreboding, that if the Roman rule developed itself without disturbance, it must at last set up the rule of the Roman religion also, that is, the most powerful form of heathenism. But certain as it is that they could be rendered

perfectly harmless only by the complete overthrow of the whole past character of Israel's existence, and certain as it is also that they did more to bring this about than all the other sections of the nation, their spasmodic, gigantic struggle could only become a struggle of extreme despair and of greatest banefulness, because they pursued in an absolutely wrong way the good object they had in view, and failed to perceive the one thing which was required at this juncture.

In reality the last portion which still remains of the history of Israel, if one determines to leave out of view Christianity, which is springing up within its sphere though meanwhile it is but little heeded, becomes extremely simple through this immediate collision of the *Zealots of the Law* (for thus we may properly designate these adherents of the above-mentioned *fourth* school) with the rule of Rome: strictly regarded, it is henceforth nothing more than a history of the relation of the Zealots of the Law to the Romans. The incessant ferment and the perpetual disquiet of this 'people of God,' which had long lain in the Messianic birth-throes, had led to the necessity of the direct Roman rule, after all attempts to set up a complete native and popular government, or even a partial one of this kind such as hardly preserved the appearance of being native, had failed. But the Roman rule was simply the most powerful and highly developed of all heathen governments. If, therefore, it had been now willingly accepted, and further, willingly borne by the whole nation, it would in that case have at last absorbed into itself the whole Judean and Israelitic commonwealth, with its inmost heart, just as the Greek rule,[1] two hundred years before, had done this until the people were driven to most dangerous reaction. But if the inmost endeavour of Israel, ever since the beginning of the whole third and final phase of this history, was really to be raised above all danger of being absorbed into heathenism, even in its most highly developed form; if during from eight to ten centuries the real point at issue at the heart of the development of the Community of the true God was simply to determine how it could maintain its eternal possessions against heathenism, which was on its part growing continually more powerful, and how it could finally vanquish the latter throughout the world; and if the danger from Greece, above referred to, was in the end, although it had made such deep inroads, still so forcibly and splendidly repulsed—it is quite in accordance with the past history that in the present case the

[1] See vol. v. pp. 223 sq.

Bethany College W. Va. CARNEGIE LIBRARY

most polished and sharpest weapon is at once presented against the danger from Rome, and that both from without and from within everything comes with sudden clearness to the front which would otherwise have probably long remained more confused and undeveloped as regards its deeper foundation. Without doubt, the Gaulonite Judas and his followers were animated by a profounder feeling for the ultimate destination, for the honour, and also for a very important part of the duty of Israel, than was possessed by those Judeans and Samaritans who had gone to Rome to request its direct rule, simply for the sake of present temporal quiet. The Gaulonite fetched from the profound roaring abyss of the whole tendency and development of this last phase of the history of Israel simply the sharpened weapons which had been supplied in it. He was only distinguished by this, that no one else had possessed the self-reliance to bring them forth so properly and so clearly as he in the crucial intense activity of this last period, in presence of the most terrible heathen power. Thus weapons were drawn on both sides; everything on the part of the two irreconcilable opponents had become perfectly clear; and, as now with the Roman power really the whole heathen world stood opposed to this small nation, so in the nation itself the existing internal divisions necessarily lost their chief significance, because no other of them was any longer of so strong and clear a way of thinking as this most recent party. It had its unavoidable necessity in the time itself; if broken up outwardly, and most furiously persecuted, it could nevertheless never be destroyed, except with the complete ruin of Israel itself as it had hitherto existed; its adherents, few as they might be in number, must nevertheless at every favourable moment arouse and agitate most profoundly the mind of the whole nation. The defect of the adherents of this party was simply the same as that of the Hagiocracy generally, and that, with all their zeal for the true God, they did not properly seek, still less find, those better things which they really might perhaps have been able to find. Although this defect of theirs, which, small as it seems, owing to the tremendous importance of these critical times, still hid within it immeasurable calamity, was the more pardonable in the Zealots of the Law, so long as those better things had not yet come, about the final appearance of which really all the most severe conflicts of the last thousand years had been kindled.

Josephus feels quite properly, in treating the history of the Gaulonite, that it was from the school founded by him that all those passionate endeavours proceeded, which, in the end, com-

pletely destroyed the government in Jerusalem, and made the Romans, almost against their will, irreconcilable enemies. But, as a Pharisee, and as too unfavourably affected by the calamities of his time, he is incapable of passing a just judgment upon the Gaulonite, and, at the mention of him, already introduces, with serious complaint, a brief preliminary sketch of the last abominations which he had himself experienced in his time. He here narrates, therefore, simply that the disturbances, which had already broken out in the case of a very large portion of the people at the mere rumour of a Roman census, were quieted by the wise persuasions of the high-priest Joazar, the son of Boethus. This Joazar was nominated high-priest by Herod during the last days of his life, when Matthias, who was suspected of inclining to the views of the Zealots,[1] was deposed. It is easy to infer from this that he was a very moderate man. Nevertheless, again on account of a suspicion of his participation in the conspiracies after Herod's death, Archelaus appointed his brother, Eleazar (whom he did not long retain), his successor.[2] The first act of the Roman government appears, therefore, to have been his restoration; and, if he had had also to suffer from the Herods, his present influence upon the people in Jerusalem is all the more intelligible. As a matter of course, the Gaulonite, with his following, did not nevertheless submit, and sought to provoke a public rising. Still Josephus passes over his end in silence. We know, however, from another source, that he perished by the sword, and his following was dispersed;[3] further, that although he had fallen young, his way of thinking descended to his sons and grandsons, who in subsequent years perished in the same manner.[4]

For the present moment, therefore, the participation of the Zealots of the Law in the sudden turn of affairs had been too rapidly developed into public action, and the entire situation of the people, just freed from the Herodian rule, too new to permit the complete carrying out of their views thus early. Moreover, the Gaulonite was the less able to promise his fellow-countrymen material advantages at that time, as the Romans, in accordance with their usual custom, undoubtedly this time also sought to propitiate their subjects on the change

[1] See vol. v. p. 448.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 6. 4; 13. 1.

[3] Acts v. 37.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 5. 2; and *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 8 sq. (comp. the grandson, vii. 8. 1) three different sons of his are mentioned, who met with their end at two different times, the last one much later and in a worse way than the first two. With this, however, must be compared the remarks which will be immediately made on the book of the *Assumption of Moses*.

of their country into a province by a small transient lightening of the taxes: a circumstance which probably had helped to induce many to seek the direct rule of Rome after the death of Herod ten years before. The direct rule of Rome now soon established itself, and remained, in spite of isolated provocations to dangerous movements, on the whole undisturbed during the rest of Augustus's life, as well as under the reign of the Emperor Tiberius, which was, particularly in the provinces, very peaceful and tolerably just. A thirty years' peace came once more over the exhausted land, similar to that long peace which had attended the reign of Herod, and had proved so advantageous for trade and commerce, for science, art, and every good work, and had met with the gratitude of many who were still living. Those lovers of repose who had desired the direct rule of Rome now enjoyed for a long time the fruits of their endeavours in a prosperity and abundance which seemed at that time, under the wings of Roma Æterna, to promise unbroken duration. But in the schools of the learned, as well as amongst the people, the question which might easily become the occasion of a dangerous contention, was all along being asked, whether a true Judean ought to pay tribute to the Emperor;[1] and the strong dislike to the publicans, which was developed and kept up amongst the common people of the whole land during these years of peace, so that they were all placed frequently on a level even with the 'sinners' and 'unclean,' that is, the heathen,[2] although there were really Judeans amongst these officers, and many very respectable people, had all along its deepest ground simply in the national feeling provoked by the Hagiocracy of that time, that the heathen ought not to rule in the Holy Land, and in the indelible bad impression which the Roman census, with its attendant circumstances, had left on the general public mind. The fire, which had only broken out in full flame in the Gaulonite, remained through all this time more or less smouldering in the heart of the whole nation. And in the midst of the Pharisees there now remained permanently the Zealots as a distinct party, although, for the time, they gave up all thought of an insurrection against the Romans.[3]

[1] Matt. xxii. 15–22, comp. xvii. 24–27.

[2] This is sufficiently well known from the New Testament. The only thing remarkable is, that evidently the same view prevailed also in the lands subject to the Tetrarchs. These had, therefore, settled their customs and taxes quite like those of Rome; on which point see further below.

[3] The apostle Judas with the surname *Καναναῖος* cannot belong to these (see below); and Paul describes himself as at one time *ζηλωτής* (Gal. i. 14; Acts xxii. 3).

The Book of the Assumption of Moses.

We have, however, recently been put into a position to perceive plainly, from quite another aspect of it, of what great importance the agitation of the Gaulonite was. For it may be said that as every profoundly influential event in the history of Israel is signalised at least by one corresponding memorial in the literature and literary art of the nation, so we are now able to show that this event of the activity and fall of Judas the Gaulonite, which was of such vast significance for all the remaining history of the nation, was immortalised by such a memorial-work. This memorial, which is for us of special interest, on account of its origin in the times immediately preceding the movements of an entirely different spirit, which were originated by the Baptist and Christ, assumed a similar form to those which had proceeded from the last great religious commotions of the people, and which, being from the very first sustained by a new and more vigorous spirit, maintained through the fluctuations of time a less ephemeral existence. This is the *Book of the Assumption of Moses*,[1] which has only very recently been rediscovered, at least the first half of it. It is a book belonging to the class of artistic prophecy, which was so much in favour in those days. And now that it has been recovered, we can plainly see that as the first dawn of the Maccabean times found its literary immortalisation through the Book of Daniel,[2] and, subsequently, the climax of all their endeavours through the Books of Enoch and Noah,[3] so also the revival produced by the Gaulonite, which, though brief in outward appearance, was lasting in its hidden and profound effects, found its immortality in literature by means of this work.

As may be inferred from reliable indications, the book did not appear prior to the fall of the Gaulonite, but not long afterwards, when the movement which had been started by him was still powerfully throbbing under all the first and most intense impressions which he had produced. Accordingly we find in it the cautiousness in writing which was required by the straits of the times, combined with the art of veiled antici-

[1] The remarks on this book in vol. v. p. 479 receive here simply a more exact explanation and precise treatment, the subject having been in the meantime dealt with at greater length in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1867, pp. 110–117. For ready reference I have retained the division of chapters introduced into Hilgenfeld's edition. Comp. also Wieseler's essay on the book in the *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, 1868, pp. 622–48.

[2] See vol. v. pp. 302 sq.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 345 sq.

pation and prophecy, which had at that time been so elaborately perfected. The result was a book of this extremely artistic and ingenious character as regards its plan and execution. Like all such works, it presents from the range of view of its own time and of the experiences and new forebodings which were conditioned by the latter, a new general survey of all the past and the future, worked out, not with an artistic perfection equal to its boldness, but with all the greater originality; and as like all kindred works its art is based upon the fresh glorification of a holy man of antiquity, its veiled no less than its actual prophecy, just as in the case of all similar works, is employed simply within the framework of historical narrative and description. Now, it is in conformity simply with the time and the highest aims of the Gaulonite that in this case no less a man than Moses himself is selected as the hero of antiquity, with whom everything is here connected. For what did the Gaulonite desire, so far as he gave his aims an historical connection, more than the highest glorification of Moses and of the Law as it was understood by him? Indeed Moses stands so high in the estimation of our Bible-prophet[1] that he makes him, or rather the last days of his life, the sublime centre of all the past, nay, of the whole history of the world down to the Messianic consummation. It is true he does not affect a division of history on the basis of exact numbers, such as we find in the books of Daniel and Enoch; on the contrary, he is satisfied simply to indicate in broad outlines and general names of periods the Divine relations which he meets with in the consideration of the marvellous changes of history generally, and to leave them to be found out as if they were celestial enigmas. But inasmuch as he adopts, following the various previous examples of the Book of Enoch and yet in an original manner, 5,000 years as the sacred cycle of all history until the coming of the Messiah, he places the last days of Moses in the year 2500 before this event.[2] It is true that so far as we know none of the various early chronological computations which were then derived from the numbers found in the Pentateuch, declared that just 2,500 years had elapsed between the Creation and the death of Moses; still they really approached this number,[3] and our Bible-prophet

[1] As the man may be briefly designated who supposes himself to be a prophet mainly on account of his apt and believing use of the Holy Scriptures.

[2] *Tempora* CCL.; but in what special sense these *tempora*, καιροί, are to be understood, is precisely the enigma which the readers are to solve according to all other indications.

[3] According to the Hebrew Pentateuch there would be 1,556, 390, 215, 430, and 40, in all 2,631 years; according to the Greek Pentateuch, fewer.

uses everywhere simply large round proportions. The period from the death of Moses to the time of the author amounted, on the contrary, according to the greatest length assigned to it by the learned chronologists of the time,[1] to much less than 2,500 years; and although the time from the present of the author to the coming of the Messiah had to be deducted, the period would still be too extended. However, our Bible-prophet could conceive this long series of years until the coming of the Messiah as shortened[2] by Divine mercy to a term of 25×70 instead of 25×100, or of 1,750 instead of 2,500 years. In that case it became possible for him also in the various great crises of this time, which may be briefly called the Mosaic time, to fix corresponding periods, of seventy years each in round numbers, in such a way that attentive, longing readers could see therein so many hints regarding the nearness of the longed-for salvation.

To give here a short general view of the book, and at the same time an example of the prophecies and calculations of such Bible-prophets, who constantly became of greater importance according to the whole spirit of the times, we find the 25 *year-weeks*, or briefly *years*, are so divided that particularly the first 6 or 7 when there were no kings in Israel, that is, in the view of our author, when Israel dwelt in the land according to the principles of a pure Theocracy, are distinguished from the 18 or 19 when it was ruled by princes and tyrants[3] (that is, domestic and foreign princes). Of these 18 or 19 years there are distinguished (1) 7 (that is, 490) when Jerusalem shall be strongly fortified by the Sanctuary (that is, the time from David until the destruction of Jerusalem): next (2) 9 (that is, 630) years when God gladdens His people with His special protection, but when they already sink too low into heathenism, that is, the same times, but commenced earlier, perhaps from the period where the books of Kings begin. These 9 years close with the conquest by a *king from the East*, as Nabuchodrozzor is here called in direct antithesis to the later king and conqueror *from the West*, that is, Augustus.[4] After these 9 follow, lastly

[1] According to the observations, vol. ii. pp. 83 sq., 371 sq.

[2] Corresponding to the sacredness of the years of jubilee, and the type given in the Book of Daniel, ch. ix. [See the author's subsequent treatment of this chapter in the second edition of his *Commentary on the Prophets*, English translation, vol. v. pp. 267 sq.—Tr.]

[3] In ch. ii. that is, the hiatus after *intrabunt in terram suam annos* must be supplied in some such way as by *vi. et vii. sine regibus erunt*, unless in this passage the number twenty-five was first mentioned in a general sense.

[4] Ch. iii. at the beginning compared with ch. vi. at the end. The seven and the nine are, ch. ii., plainly brought into connection with the time of the foundation and also of the division of the Davidic kingdom according to the ten and two tribes; and the number nine, as the most important of the two, is repeated, ch. vii. in a clear connection.

(3), 3 and 3 and 2 of such years,[1] evidently those of the Persian, the Greek and the Roman rule, the Persian being reckoned correctly as about 210 (3 times 70) ordinary years, the Greek, which in fact gradually passed into the Roman before Pompey, likewise as 210, so that the Roman rule, if it was considered as having lasted from about 110 years B.C., had not then outlasted as much as two of these seventy years. If there are now (4) added to these four different governments, the one being native and the three foreign, which are here regarded as the *four* great *hours*, that is, sections of time in those 18 to 19 year-days,[2] the 77 years of the Babylonian captivity, which are specially distinguished,[3] we get as the result the above 18 to 19 years which must elapse after the pure Theocracy; yet the time when the proper sacrifices will be presented in the Temple is correctly limited to the 7 first and the 8 last named, accordingly to the round number of 15 of such year-days.[4]

Our author, therefore, makes Moses, in the year 2500 after the Creation[5] and the last hours of his own life, discourse with Joshua regarding this immense period of history, which, as our Bible-prophet conceives it, is destined soon to become the truly Mosaic period. He clothes that which had already become matter of past history in the form of an artificially veiled future, and not until the end, where Messianic anticipation comes in, does he pass into pure and simple prophecy. Now, as the whole work was written not only to arouse and inspire its readers, but also to add to the glory of Moses himself, it is quite intelligible that the book should close with a narrative description of the death of Moses, in which the immortal side of his work and his spirit is presented in a far more glorious light than is the case at the end of the Pentateuch. The days of the highest glorification of the memory of Moses that could ever occur in the course of history had now been long approaching; and as far as this glorification could find its perfect expressions in a narrative of the end of his earthly career, it finds this here. We refer to the beautiful representation of the conflict between Satan and Michael for the eternal possession of Moses at the moment of his death, when the former imagines that he can

[1] According to the correct reading, ch. vii.

[2] The four *hours* which are distinguished (ch. vii.) must be different from the so-called *years* occurring elsewhere; and (ch. vii.–ix.) the discourse recurs to its commencement (ch. vii.).

[3] Ch. iii. *ad fin.*

[4] Ch. ii., if xv. must be read here instead of xx. This whole matter is here discussed more plainly than in the passage of the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* above referred to.

[5] These numbers have here at the commencement been quite clearly preserved, and in so far as they supply early evidence regarding the calculation from the *years since the Creation* are also memorable, as has been shown in the *Göttinger Nachrichten*, 1865, pp. 513 sq.

claim him, because even Moses had once really failed to maintain his faith with sufficient purity, but the latter victoriously defends him. The idea that neither can a grave hold the body of Moses nor a sepulchral monument (even if it were a pyramid) suffice for him, since the whole earth is his grave and his monument,[1] is similar. It is true that that narrative, together with the entire conclusion of the book, is wanting in the one original document, mentioned above, which has come down to us: still, the whole book received from that narrative the short name of the *Assumption*,[2] or ascension, *of Moses*. And we have ample evidence of the popularity of the work in those first times for which it was primarily written. But if it was less popular amongst its later readers, because they no longer appreciated the living traits of the time of its origin, and if on that account it was variously recast under the hands of subsequent Jewish scholars, its simple fundamental thought, at all events, was still all along preserved in these editions, as was further remarked above.[3]

But if we read the book simply as it presents itself in its primary meaning to us, it carries us back most vividly to those fundamental conceptions under the influence of which the Gaulonite and his adherents acted, as it also, in its veiled manner, portrays vividly enough simply the pictures of the most recent past. It is worthy of note, that amongst the somewhat older stories it is only the relation of the Two Tribes to the Ten which are remaining in exile, or rather in foreign countries, and there multiplying not unprosperously, to which more express reference is made;[4] but thus all the members of the ancient nation who were dwelling in the East were manifestly already in these times reckoned to belong to the Ten Tribes, and often boasted of their prosperity.[5] On the other hand, the true glory of the Maccabean times is in our book already as good as forgotten; and in that the bad example which the last Asmoneans had set reflected its impure light upon them all, they are already all called totally unworthy priests, indeed, 'Slaves born from slaves,'[6] as the early Pharisees threw this in the teeth first of Hyrcanus I. and Jannæus.[7] But the blackest shadow falls, in the first place, upon the layman Herod,

[1] Ch. xi.

[2] *Assumptio*, or rather acc. ch. x. *Receptio Mosis*, Ἀνάληψις, acc. Gen. v. 24.

[3] Vol. ii. pp. 226 sq. Comp. also de Jelinek's *Bet-Hamidrasch*, i. pp. 115 sq.

[4] Ch. iii. *passim* and ch. iv. *ad fin.* That the two tribes of the New Jerusalem always remain *tristes et gementes* is a feature in which our author agrees entirely with the expression Dan. ix. 25.

[5] Comp. vol. v. p. 91.

[6] Ch. v. and ch. vi. *ad init.* It may be seen from this that the earlier Asmoneans also were reprobated before they appropriated the royal name.

[7] Vol. v. pp. 382 sq.

who is plainly enough represented even with reference to his long reign of thirty-four years. He is placed on a level with an Egyptian Pharaoh, and he is specially censured because he did not even deem the honoured ones of younger and older years worthy of the honour of burial.[1] And the conquest of the country which thereupon followed by the 'king of kings' from the West (Augustus), the abominations[2] which occurred in connexion therewith, and the brief reign of all Herod's sons,[3] which could at that time be conjectured, appeared to our Bible-prophet already as so many foretokens of the approaching end of all earthly things. Still, from the other side, there falls, secondly, an equally black shadow upon those whom he does not, it is true, plainly call the Pharisees of that time but perceptibly enough describes as such; ambitious of rule, loving revenge, self-righteous and self-satisfied, deceitful and hypocritical in all things and at all times, lovers of pleasure and sycophants, who, notwithstanding their impurity of heart are always crying *noli me tangere!*[4] And accordingly there appears in the book nothing referring to the most recent time of a cheering nature, with the one brilliant exception of the man of the tribe of Levi, who is unmistakably enough meant to be the Gaulonite, although he is indicated only by an enigmatical name.[5] After his attempt had already failed, a second outburst of Roman revenge, similar to that of ten years previously, had taken place,[6] and that which seemed the worst abomination had happened to women and children,[7] he still called forth his seven sons: 'although even a heathen nation had never suffered

[1] Ch. vi.

[2] Ch. vi. and ch. viii. the chief thing censured is that he *crucified* some, of course, not slaves but freemen. Acc. vol. v. p. 422 there were really 2,000 crucified. Further, that he burned a portion of the Temple. The extent to which this was done is stated *ibid.* p. 416.

[3] *Et producet natos succedentes sibi breviora tempora*, ch. vi. This could only be conjectured just as Archelaus was deposed and banished. How could anyone write thus after the other sons of Herod had reigned as long as, or even longer, than himself?

[4] I have reproduced this much more elaborate description (ch. vii.), which presents the most instructive agreement with the New Testament, only in a very much abbreviated form. Unfortunately, it has hitherto not been made even completely legible.—The *noli tangere! ne inquines me!* is not the Samaritan expression of a later time explained vol. vii. p. 122 [German], but finds its explanation in the remarks vol. v. p. 369.

[5] The letters ΤΑΞΩ, ch. vii., may have been cast into a shape resembling a Greek word, but are plainly intended, according to the literal devices referred to vol. v. p. 190, simply to disguise the real proper name. Unfortunately, we do not now know the patronymic of the Gaulonite, as the basis of an attempt to decipher the enigma.

[6] There is evidently great emphasis laid in ch. viii. and ix. upon the '*altera* ultio crudelis.'

[7] Acc. ch. viii: *Uxores eorum diris donabuntur gentibus, et* (supply *qui*) *filii eorum pueri secabantur, a medicis pubis inducent acrobystiam illis* (comp. v. p. 269). The Latin translation is everywhere extremely clumsy; but numerous copyists' errors may be readily corrected, as, ch. xi., *Amorrhæorum* instead of Araborum.

so much as Israel, they must with him look only to their fathers and forefathers who had never tempted God to transgress his commandments; they knew well their own better strength; and should nothing else remain to them all, then he must pray them to withdraw, after a three days' fast, with him into a cave, and rather to die than to transgress the Divine commandments; in that case their blood would surely be avenged by God.' We know from what has been said above what he understood by the Divine commands; but we now see also that he was a Levite by birth, that he had separated himself far enough from the generality of the Pharisees of his time, and was prepared to die like one of the boldest Maccabeans. And it is possible that one of his seven sons, of whom some lived to see the great struggle for freedom nearly seventy years afterwards,[1] is our Bible-prophet himself.

It will appear by-and-by what Messianic hopes formed the conclusion of the whole. The entire book is like a precursor of the *fourth book of Ezra*,[2] save that the latter is upon a much more elaborate and learned plan. It is the first prophetic book against Rome known to us, and designates Rome, like the Ezra-book, under the symbol of the *eagle*.[3]

The Roman Governors; Pontius Pilate.

Of the dispositions and deeds of the first four governors we know but very little, neither should we know very much more of the last of this period, Pontius Pilate, if he had not become more familiar through the New Testament. It is in great part the greater peace of the years themselves to which we owe this deficiency of more detailed reports. Under Pontius Pilate, when the peace begins to be gradually more disturbed, the reports become more numerous apart from the New Testament. We may conclude without doubt that the governors were always directed by the Emperors themselves to deal as considerately as possible with the laws and prejudices of the nation: this appears also from the fact that the Judean coins which were struck under them, down to the times of the war of Nero, still bear, as formerly under the native princes, no effigies of gods or men.[4] For thus scrupulously had the dominant party in the

[1] See p. 53.

[2] Of which an account is given in vol. vii. [German].

[3] *Tum felix tu Israel, et ascendes supra cervices et alas aquilæ*, ch. x.

[4] See the copies in Saulcy's *Recherches sur la Numismatique Judaïque*, Paris, 1854, pl. viii. and ix., and in Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage* (London, 1864), pp. 135-153. Herod the Great also and his successor in Jerusalem, Archelaus, had been, as far as we see at present,

learned schools now for a long time interpreted the Decalogue, and also imagined thereby to erect an impassable barrier between heathenism and the true religion—an endeavour which was only too successful. For the Temple taxes only such pieces of money as had no human images upon them seem to have been taken—probably one of the causes why the money-changers were so numerous at the Temple. But in ordinary affairs Roman money in every other form circulated.[1]

The first three of these governors occupied with their period of office the remaining seven to eight years of the reign of Augustus. So rapidly were these first governors changed in the country, which could only be gradually brought to a condition of perfect quiet, and so rigorously did Augustus keep his eye upon this people with which he was only too well acquainted. Moreover, it was the habit of Augustus to change the governors more frequently than Tiberius, not always to the advantage of the countries concerned. The first governor who was sent from Rome at the same time with P. Quirinius was Coponius, a Roman knight: to which rank most of the others also belonged, as the Emperors, in the case of such provinces as Judea, had specially in view the system of taxation which was often assigned to the knights. Before P. Quirinius handed over to him the sole administration he deposed the high-priest Joazar, who had been, as we saw above,[2] only just reappointed by himself. The census had been already finished with his help, but since he very shortly afterwards involved himself in conflict with the people generally, for some cause not known to us, the Roman plenipotentiary considered it better to appoint a more popular successor to him before his own departure into Syria.[3] But generally, after Herod had displaced and then destroyed the Asmoneans, the high-priests were very frequently changed, and simply at the arbitrary will of the secular rulers. Herod and Archelaus had introduced this prerogative of the secular govern-

very cautious in this respect. (See the copies in Madden, pp. 83–95.) The former chose at first some new images, but soon resorted again to those used by the Seleucidæ and Asmonæans. The procurators then placed upon the coins other harmless images, such as palms, lilies, but none of them ventured to inscribe upon the coins another name than that of the ruling Cæsar or sometimes of the Imperatrix. Comp. *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1862, pp. 67 sq., 273 sq. According to the *Gem.* on תי, iv. 1, R. Menahem, son of R. Simai, would never look at an image on the coins. However, as a fact, the Romans, after the destruction of Jerusalem, paid no longer the slightest attention to such Judean scruples. As to the coins of the other Herods, see below.

[1] As we also see from Matt. xxii. 19–21, Christ had accordingly nothing to object against the Royal image upon the coins, and distinguishes himself in this respect also from the popular teachers in the schools of law of his time.

[2] See p. 53.

[3] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2. 1.

ment, and the Romans were equally glad to avail themselves of it whenever a change seemed to be required by the restlessness of the people, who were often hostile towards such ephemeral high-priests, or by the interests of the Roman government itself, or even of the particular governor. It is true a high-priest had always to be taken from the families who were qualified to hold this office;[1] and in consequence of the active national life of a most peculiar and most zealous character which was still perpetuated, it was never so degraded as that of the Greek Patriarch under the Turks. Nevertheless, the disparity between the Hagiocracy and the actual government could not show itself more plainly in anything than the great dependence and powerlessness of that office which ought to have been in it the most independent and powerful. The individual high-priests have accordingly but little influence on the general history of the people, and it is scarcely worth while to detain the reader with an enumeration of their mere names.[2]

During the time that Coponius held his office the only thing recorded is a disgraceful deed of the Samaritans. These people who had long been more accustomed to a foreign rule than the Judeans, and were more friendly to Rome than they, had, undoubtedly, had no share in the scruples and the insurrection on account of the Roman census, and gained probably some advantages by the cessation of the Herodian rule. For both capitals stood now equally under the Roman governor, and the one probably without more privileges than the other, which the Samaritans could very well use to their own advantage. Some of them, as it seems from malicious satisfaction at the equal humiliation of the Judeans, stole at Easter to Jerusalem, and in the night of the Passover, after the doors of the Temple had been opened according to ancient custom,[3] threw about human bones in the sacred building. Thereby the House of God was according to ancient ideas so completely desecrated that this time no ceremony could be held in it at the feast, since it had first to be solemnly purified again by special

[1] That is, of the descendants of Aaron. See *Antiquities*, pp. 288 sq.

[2] See Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2. 2. According to xx. 10, *ad fin.*, there were nominated altogether twenty-seven high-priests from the conquest of Jerusalem by Herod and the Romans and the overthrow of the Asmonæan high-priesthood to the destruction under Titus, these twenty-seven reigning 108 years. But when he here calls the existing Judean constitution an *aristocracy* under the national presidency of the high-priest, just as he also calls the constitution of Gabinius (vol. v. pp. 402 sq.) an aristocracy (xiv. 5, 4), it is probable he means thereby not that the existing constitution was the same in detail as that instituted by Gabinius, but only that, after the cessation of the monarchy, the Synedrion received once more higher authority as was above described, p. 38.

[3] As a sign of the petition that God might graciously pass over. See *Antiquities*, p. 353.

sacrifices.[1] Precautions were then taken against the repetition of similar scandals, but it may easily be conceived that thereby the ill-feeling and the commotion in Jerusalem, which had been scarcely allayed, increased. Probably on account of this new unforeseen danger of internal revolt, Coponius was recalled to Rome after a brief term of office.

Still less is known concerning the second governor, *Marcus Ambivius*, and the third, *Annius Rufus*. The latter would probably have remained longer if Augustus had not died so soon. The new Emperor sent another governor, whereby we also know particularly that the third governor retired in the year 14 or 15 A.D.[2]

During the whole reign of nearly twenty-three years of the Emperor Tiberius, there were, on the other hand, only two governors: first, *Valerius Gratus*, who ruled eleven years, then Pontius Pilate, whose term of office was nearly as long. Among the acts of the first are mentioned only four removals of high-priests: the fourth and last whom he newly appointed was Joseph, called *Kajâpha*,[3] the same man who retained his power unexpectedly long, his term of office outlasting that of Pilate, and ending by his deposition[4] in the year 36, and who is also familiar to us from the New Testament. Caiaphas's father-in-law Anna, or rather Anan (Chanan), the son of Seth, appointed by Quirinius, had, however, held the office until the arrival of Valerius Gratus, therefore likewise a considerable period for these last times. It was subsequently narrated of him as a piece of special good fortune, that his five sons had all held the office.[5]

The information we possess concerning *Pontius Pilate*, appointed about the year 26, is not sufficient to show that he was from the first a wholly incapable and indolent or a sanguinary man, but rather that he was a man somewhat covetous and imperious, and moreover considerably indifferent to righteousness and truth in the higher sense. Called into office subsequently to the first and better half of the reign of Tiberius, he already displays by a certain negligence and imprudence in connection

[1] See *Antiquities*, p. 149 sq.

[2] Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 2. 2, says nothing further regarding the duration of the office of these first three governors; neither do we know from ancient sources any further particulars with regard to it.

[3] Properly, Kajjâpha, commonly improperly contracted into Kaipha. The name כַּיָּפָא is Aramaic, and signifies originally almost the same as the German *Steinmetz*, English *Stonemason*.

[4] Comp. Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2. 2; 4. 3. The Peshito writes the two names ܩܝܦܐ ܘܝܘܣܦ. In the first, at least, the correct reminiscence appears to be preserved.

[5] According to Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2. 1, 2; xx. 9. 1; John xviii. 18. Comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 233.

with a rude defiance the commencing deterioration of the Roman rule. Still his chief fault was that he was not properly acquainted, nor took the trouble to acquaint himself, with the idiosyncrasies and the profoundest feelings of the singular nation whom he was called to govern. But this nation itself began once more in this longer period of repose to feel its strength and its rights even in the face of Roman omnipotence, and thus the mutual relations were gradually increasingly embittered, it must be allowed mainly through the fault of the Roman.

He was at first so ignorant of the prejudices of the people, and of the consideration which his own predecessors had shown to them, that he ordered the division of the army which went from Samaria to its winter quarters in Jerusalem [1] to march with the bust of the Emperor on the standards.[2] The insignia of the Romans, such as the eagle, the busts of the Emperors, were certainly superstitiously and idolatrously worshipped, as was to be expected from a nation of antiquity which regarded war, victory, and the subjugation of others as the highest attainment, and as the Romans occupied in these things the same stage as the Assyrians and similar barbarously warlike conquerors.[3] The Judeans, in spite of the scrupulous directions of the Hagiocracy, which attached the highest importance to the avoidance of idol-worship as the form of opposing heathenism, had, it is true, long since learned almost everywhere, and even within the Holy Land itself, to bear the sight of such idolatrous images and their worship. Only within the precincts of the Holy City and in its territory such a sight was to them altogether an abomination, and if the signs of heathenism covered the whole world besides, they should not at least disgrace this one little spot of the earth as the last refuge of the true religion. In reality this was a throbbing pulse of the life which still stirred so actively in the nation. The privileges, moreover, which had been previously on that account granted by Greek kings to the Holy City, as an asylum, could be appealed to in Jerusalem.[4] If, therefore, the sanguinary insurrection above described[5] broke out merely on account of an eagle which Herod placed upon a new edifice, simply from flattery of Augustus, how much less could the perpetual public worship of such images be now en-

[1] See *ante*, p. 39.

[2] To suppose that Pilate himself was then in Jerusalem would, in spite of the apparent meaning of the words in Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 2 sq.; *Ant.* xviii. 3. 1, be against the general connection of the narrative.

[3] Comp. Hab. i. 11, 16, and the kindred passages in the Old Testament even.

[4] See *ante*, p. 38.

[5] Vol. v. p. 447 sq.

dured! Without doubt a terrible noise would have been raised forthwith at their entrance, if that had not taken place wholly unexpectedly in the night. Not till morning was the setting up of the Roman images beheld as an accomplished fact, and to the gathering multitude who hastened up in indignation many thousands from the surrounding districts very soon associated themselves. Still it was prudently resolved to go *en masse* to Cæsarea to the governor, simply praying for remedy. The governor firmly refused to make concessions to the petitioning multitudes, supposing that the honour of the Emperor would otherwise suffer; and five days and nights the petitioners tarried, besieging him without intermission. On the sixth day he determined with one stroke to put an end to the matter. He caused his judgment-seat to be set up in the Hippodrome, placed a number of soldiers in the background, concealed in the extensive place, and awaited what the Judeans would then do. But here also they besieged him with their prayers. He ordered the soldiers at a given sign suddenly to come forth and surround the suppliants, and from his judgment-seat threatened immediate death if they did not quietly return home. But, throwing themselves to the ground, they bared their necks and cried that they preferred to die rather than see their wise laws violated. Such steadfastness in defence of the laws of the country he had not expected: struck with astonishment, he yielded, and ordered the images to be immediately removed from Jerusalem to Cæsarea.

This was an incident attended by most important consequences. As the Hindoos, likewise a nation fallen from earlier greatness but preserving still most vivid and sacred recollections of it, in our own time sit *sthîrṇa*,[1] days and nights besieging the door of a potentate for something which seems to them holy, similarly we see the Judeans then acting by the force of simple holy petition, besieging and finally overcoming the ruler. They had now perceived what the force of prayer could do if it passed into petition storming the ruler; they had therewith obtained a new form of weapon and mode of combat against the most terrible power of the heathen world, and how much might they be able further to obtain therewith after the magic of Roman firmness had once been thus dispelled!

From this time forward Pilate was, at all events, unable to do things so as not to displease the common people, although,

[1] [Sanscrit scholars whom I have consulted as to this word *sthîrna* do not know whence Ewald derived it; but the custom itself is well known in India, and the phrase 'sitting *dhărnā*' is actually passing into English. Comp. Fallows' *New Hindustani-English Dictionary*, s.v. *dhărnă* —Tr.]

after such serious warning, he evidently desired to adapt himself to their requirements wherever it appeared to him feasible. Thus he subsequently caused an expensive aqueduct to Jerusalem to be built, or rather restored. It was, according to one account,[1] some two hundred stadia, or twenty-five miles in length; unfortunately, we learn nothing at present from other sources regarding its direction; but, may, however, infer, on general grounds,[2] that it was that one coming from the south, the traces of which have now been somewhat more accurately rediscovered, and which, probably, was first made by Solomon in his day, as he was the founder of all the greatest structures of Jerusalem. Now Pilate undoubtedly undertook this great construction, not for his own pleasure, but at the wish of the Synedrion, probably particularly of the priests also, as the most abundant supply of good water was one of the first necessities for the city, and especially for the Temple. The example of the great Roman waterworks under Augustus might also be before his mind, as the Romans, since the time of Augustus, were glad to provide such things also for the advantage of the provinces. If he employed moneys for this purpose from the Temple treasury, that was not exactly a perversion, since they were especially designed also to keep up the buildings connected with the Temple. So far, therefore, as we at present see, there was here no just cause for dissatisfaction with him. However, the mass of the people was nevertheless not pleased with the execution of the work, and when he came to Jerusalem many thousands demanded, with loud cries, its cessation; abusive words against the representative of the Emperor escaped the crowd. Thereupon he caused many soldiers in private clothes and armed with staves simply, to surround the noisy multitude, commanded them to be quiet and depart to their houses, and, as the abusive words became simply worse, gave the sign for attack. The Roman soldiers executed the command only too eagerly, so that many innocent persons also were slain or wounded. This incident, of course, took place during a feast and near the prætorium,[3] accordingly not far from the Temple; it is also possible that the disturbance extended into the Temple itself. We may, therefore, very well suppose that on the

[1] In Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 2. On the other hand, he named (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 4) even four hundred; instead of which, however, Eusebius (*Ecc. Hist.* ii. 6), as well as the ancient Latin translation, reads only three hundred. Instead of four hundred, the Consul Schultz (*Jerusalem*, Berlin, 1845) proposed to read forty only, as Bethlehem, where the commencement of the aqueduct is supposed to be, is only that distance from Jerusalem; but this change is doubtful.

[2] See vol. iii. p. 253.

[3] See *ante*, p. 39.

occasion of this sanguinary 'misunderstanding' the innocent Galileans also, who had come up to the feast, perished, whose 'blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices,' as this was then narrated among the people, and as the report of it reached Galilee while Christ was teaching there.[1] We still plainly hear in this strong phrase the first fresh indignation of the people at this lamentable event. And the fall of the 'tower near Siloam,' that is, not far from the Temple, by which eighteen inhabitants of Jerusalem were slain, had probably occurred at the beginning of the construction of this aqueduct: for it is mentioned in a very ancient source,[2] in close connection with the above calamity, as something frequently related in Galilee at the time of Christ; and if the commencement of the great work of so long duration was signalised by such accidents of evil omen, as it seemed to the people, the origin of the popular uproar when Pilate came to Jerusalem is more easily explained. Probably also the *Jesu Barrabbán*, whose liberation the infatuated populace requested, according to the Gospels,[3] had committed his act of murder during this uproar, and was then taken prisoner and condemned after a considerable period of concealment.

The incident during Pilate's governorship related by Philo[4] looks so much like the first of the above two related by Josephus, that it might be regarded as nothing more than a variation of this, were not the circumstances in both too dissimilar, and had Philo not been too near a contemporary. Moreover, it occurred in a later year, at a subsequent visit of Pilate to Jerusalem. He proposed at that time simply to put up golden shields, inscribed with his name and that of the Emperor, in the royal castle at Jerusalem as *tabulæ votivæ*, as such inscriptions were erected to the Roman Emperors in public places, often from adulation.[5] And as if he had previously been sufficiently warned, he had ordered simply the absolutely necessary words, unaccompanied by any figure or allusion to heathen notions, to be engraved on the shields. But the intention was obviously to erect a Roman monument to the Emperor as lord within the Holy City also; and such consecrated public monuments could in any case be regarded

[1] Luke xiii. 1, 2.

[2] Luke xiii. 4. I have on a previous occasion shown that the piece Luke xiii. 1–5 belongs to the earliest in the whole literature of the Gospels.

[3] See further on this point below, and my work on *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. pp. 439 sq.; *the uproar* so definitely mentioned Mark xv. 7 can be no other as far as we know.

[4] *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxxviii. sq. (ii. p. 589 sq.).

[5] Especially in the East, in accordance with its ancient usages. Comp. numerous illustrations in the *Corpus Inscript. Gr.*

as sacred objects, indeed, almost as altars at which prayer could be offered and protection sought. Accordingly a commotion was raised against these shields also. The four still surviving sons of the Herodean royal family[1] and others of royal descent, as well as the officers of the city, in order to prevent popular uproar, put themselves at the head of a deputation to the governor, with the urgent petition for the withdrawal of the imperial shields; and as he hesitated to grant it, a direct application was made to Tiberius himself. But Philo considers it redounds to the Emperor's fame that he immediately commanded that the shields which had been erected to his honour should be removed to Cæsarea: a solution of the difficulty with which the governor could not be displeased.

That Pilate's conduct in the trial of Christ perfectly accorded with the character of him which is tolerably clearly discernible from all this, is a point to be subsequently examined. At last it was not even a Judean but a Samaritan 'misunderstanding' which drove him from the land in the year 37 A.D., and which Josephus[2] relates, but so unintelligibly that we are scarcely able to comprehend its whole bearing. According to him, a magician, seeking the favour of the populace, the name of whom he does not supply, had pretended that he knew the place on Mount Gerizim where Moses[3] had originally buried the sacred vessels; and a few Samaritans were so firmly convinced of the fact that actually a day was fixed when, with a solemn procession (and as if with the united labour) of the whole people, the attempt should be made to dig them up (as if in order then to begin once more as from the commencement a wholly new and genuine Mosaic life). Already endless crowds of people had gathered around the armed initiated leaders near the village Tirithana[4] at the foot of the mountain, when Pilate broke in amongst them with his well-armed horsemen and foot-soldiers, and routed them in a pitched battle, killed many, and also commanded the most notable of the captives and fugitives to be executed. It is obvious that Josephus takes no pains to give a correct account of the matter simply because it concerned

[1] These were in addition to the two Tetrarchs. Herod is also mentioned (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5, 1) as living in Jerusalem, and Phasael (acc. xvii. 1. 3). The number four thus harmonises perfectly with Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 1. 3.

[2] *Ant.* xviii. 4. 1 sq.

[3] According to the *Chron. Samar.* (Arab.) cap. xlii. the sacred vessels and other sacred relics did not disappear before the priesthood of Uzzi—i.e. (acc. to vol. ii. p. 409, *note*) shortly before the time of Eli; and, in fact, it is impossible to understand how a Samaritan could speak of Moses in this connection.

[4] According to another reading *Tirithaba* or *Tiribatha*. Its situation has not been as yet re-discovered, unless it may be *et Tireh*, which, however, lies far to the west.

the Samaritans. But if this took place in the year 36, and if (as we may for the present presume) this leader of the populace was perhaps the well-known Simon Magus,[1] we can understand how in the first days of Christianity, when the great new movement of this religion issued from Jerusalem, in Samaria also an attempt at a new rising of the people answering to the Samaritan character could be made. The tradition of the buried sacred vessels had then been long in existence,[2] and a man like Simon could quite well base upon it his plans of a reconstruction of the affairs of the country; and if Pilate had been obliged to make concessions to the Judeans in so many respects, the Samaritans also might venture, in their wonted rivalry with them, to present a somewhat bolder front still. Accordingly Pilate on his part also probably deemed it needful this time to restore with somewhat greater severity the reputation of Rome as it was everywhere too boldly threatened; and then followed the massacre. As a fact, the Council of Elders in Samaria looked upon the gathering together of the people simply as an attempt to get a more general popular consultation regarding the condition of the nation; and as it seemed to the elders that the governor had shown too little consideration in his method of dispersing the crowd, they sent their complaint against him to L. Vitellius (the father of the Emperor of this name), who had come into the East with extraordinary imperial powers,[3] and could have long been known as a tender-hearted and compliant ruler. It was protested to him that the popular gathering intended no such thing as a rising against the Emperor, but simply a consultation concerning the constant arbitrary acts of the governor. The Samaritans, moreover, were always regarded as well-disposed to Rome. Vitellius thereupon sent one of his assistants, Marcellus, to the south to inquire into the matter, and Pilate received from him instructions to answer for himself in Rome, in the matter of the charges which would be there laid against him by the inhabitants of Samaria. Reluctantly yielding, he at length took ship; but, before he had reached Rome, Tiberius had died, in the year 37. So far we have reliable information regarding the end of his career through Josephus. According to Eusebius, he must then have been banished to Gaul by Caius, and in despair shortly afterwards committed suicide there. However, although Eusebius refers[4] for these alleged facts to the accounts of

[1] See with regard to him below [untranslated vol.].

[2] See vol. v. p. 170, *note*.

[3] Tac. *Ann.* vi. 32.

[4] In his *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 7; previously in *Chron. Arm.* ii. p. 266 sq. For the various legends regarding his end, see Tischendorf's *Evangelia Apocrypha*, pp.

earlier Greek Chroniclers, we must regret that he does not quote them more definitely. And when the whole career of the governor is regarded from the point of view of this end of his power, we can quite well understand the highly unfavourable idea of his entire character to which his contemporary Philo gave, from the talk of his time in Alexandria, only too ready and abundant expression,[1] in accordance with his general habit; whilst Josephus finds no occasion whatever to record such a general unfavourable judgment concerning him.

2. *The Administrations of the Herods; the Herodians.*

Whilst these first five Roman governors ruled the two great capitals, Jerusalem and Samaria, with their provinces, the administration of the three sons of Herod was retained in the form which it had received after Herod's death and the confirmation of his last will by Augustus;[2] and none of these Herodians who now ruled over separate portions of their father's kingdom could do better than, during the long time of peace, follow his example by sedulously promoting trade and agriculture, founding and rebuilding cities, and, above all things, securing under all circumstances the favour of the Emperor. In other respects, however, the history and fortunes of these three administrations were very different.

Salome, Herod's sister, died during the governorship of the above-named M. Ambivius,[3] accordingly about the year 10. On her death-bed she left her small territories by will to the Empress Julia (Livia), and they were undoubtedly immediately subject to the Governor at the time we are considering.[4]

Philip, the tetrarch of the north-eastern lands, proves by a prosperous reign of thirty-seven years that a son of Herod could really, in the best sense of the word, be a father to his subjects. There had fallen to his share a country which had from early times lain most of all in disorder, and which under Herod's rule still suffered so terribly from depredations and border conflicts. Yet by moderation, good temper, watchfulness, and strict justice he restored the interests of his land, and left behind him the reputation of a good ruler. However, he devoted himself

426–35; and on the *Acta Pilati* comp. *Jahrb. der Bibl. Wiss.* vi. pp. 49 sq. (now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 154 sq.), with the addition in Rufinus's Latin translation of Eusebius's *Ecc. Hist.* ix. 6; also at the end of the *Anakephalosis* of the so-called Hegesippus, *De Bello Jud.*

[1] *Leg. ad Caium*, cap. xxxvi.
[2] Vol. v. pp. 449 sq.
[3] See p. 64.
[4] Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1; *Ant.* xviii. 2. 2.

exclusively to his royal vocation, remained constantly (except when he went to Jerusalem to a feast) in his own country, and considered it unnecessary to be perpetually making pilgrimages to Rome, to waste there his time and his treasures. On his numerous processions through the land he was accustomed to have his throne—that is, whatever was required for the administration of justice—carried in his retinue, that he might be able everywhere to give succour and justice; just as Cæsar had everywhere carried after him tesselated pavements,[1] and as the Roman prætors and proconsuls made circuits through their provinces to deliver judgment. He rebuilt quite in the north, near the source of the Jordan, the city which the Greeks had formerly called Paneas,[2] named it Cæsarea, and placed an image of the famous temple of Pan (the *Paneion*), situated there, upon the reverse of his coins. The city was now often distinguished as Cæsarea *Philippi* or *Decapolitana*,[3] remained subsequently a large and flourishing town, as it is situated in a most productive region and not far from the old trade-road between Damascus and Egypt, but still pretty soon appears once more under its old and lasting name of Paneas (or in the present day *Bánjâs*). It is by the name of Cæsarea that the New Testament particularly speaks of it.[4] Somewhat above the north-eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee he raised the place Bethsaida, which had then fallen to a village, into a town, gave it the privileges of a town and called it *Julias*, in honour of the Empress Julia (Livia, mother of Tiberius); it appears to have been built by him somewhat later, but soon became populous, and he died in it.[5] The facts that he had the source of the Jordan in his country scientifically investigated,[6] and that he was the first of all the Herods who ventured to place the effigy of Cæsar on his coins[7] alone sufficiently show how much he esteemed a more independent culture and science. Late in life he married a niece, Salome, daughter of the Herodias who will be subsequently mentioned, and granddaughter of his half-brother Aristobulus, who had found such a sad end at the hands of Herod;[8] but as he died childless in the year 34 A.D., Tiberius connected his land directly with Syria, though he assigned its revenues solely for

[1] Suet. *Cæsar*, ch. xlvi.

[2] Vol. v. p. 236.

[3] Plin. *Nat. Hist.* v. 16, comp. vol. v. p. 455.

[4] Mark viii. 27, Matt. xvi. 13.

[5] See regarding him generally Jos. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 1; *Ant.* xviii. 2. 1; 4. 6. This Bethsaida must be different from that in Galilee, which is expressly characterised (John xii. 21) as situated in Galilee; see on the latter *infra*.

[6] According to Jos. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10. 7.

[7] Comp. Mionnet's *Description des Méd.* v. p. 566 sq. Madden's *Hist. of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 100–102.

[8] Vol. v. p. 444. The widow was afterwards married again, Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 4.

the further improvement of its buildings and trade-roads. So well were the merits of this prince appreciated in Rome.

If all the ruling Herods, or if not actually ruling, yet influential through rich compensations and their descent, had been as excellent as this one, there might have gradually arisen once more, in spite of all previous experiences, a strong love for this royal house. For we saw above plainly, in the case of Pilate's administration, how the Roman rule, even after it had established itself in peace, soon disturbed and agitated the people again in its most sacred feelings. It might appear once more to not a few that the government of a Judean house, even if of limited power, would really be better that the direct Roman rule. As we saw above,[1] *Herodians*, as they were called in these times by a name formed upon a Roman model, that is, adherents of the Herodian royal house, had previously formed themselves into a party, and (which is more remarkable) were still in existence, only that now, when the power of Herod the Great had vanished, they were compelled still more than formerly to assume the form of a mere school. It is true their ultimate aim could be based only upon the hope that it might some day be possible to restore the former power of Israel by means of the power of the Herodian dynasty. But in a time when every party even in politics sought to establish itself by means of the schools and learning, they were obliged to found a new school amongst those already existing in Jerusalem. They accordingly held fast, it is true, to Judeanism in opposition to Heathenism; in externals most of Herod's descendants also continued to adhere by preference, as their father had done, to the most indispensable laws of the Hagiocracy of those days, gladly defended their religious allies, and were regarded by many as their best advocates as against the heathen; just as we saw above[2] all the four surviving sons of Herod pleading in favour of the petition of the people against Pilate. Still, the Herodians no less than the sons of Herod, were compelled after all to expect everything primarily from the Roman power,[3] and likewise to flatter the Herods as occasion required; just as, quite contrary to the ancient custom in Israel, they kept, in accordance with heathen usages, the birthdays of the Herods like Sabbaths.[4] They

[1] Vol. v. p. 409.

[2] P. 69.

[3] Hence, in an essentially Roman question, they appear with the Pharisees, Mark xii. 13–17, comp. iii. 6. That Menahem, mentioned p. 17, would be, *e.g.*, a Herodian, of whom *M. Chagigah*, ii. 2, simply relates that, as Hillel's successor, he had *resigned*, and had Shammai as his successor; and in connection with his retirement later Talmudists add that he retired in company with eighty savants and went to the royal court covered with great honour. He was certainly not the Essene mentioned vol. v. p. 438.

[4] According to an old scholion on

might now endeavour to pave the way for an amalgamation between the Pharisees and Sadducees, just as they were aware that Herod had treated these parties, which were now really antiquated, with indifference, but their endeavours could never go deep enough. It is true that as long as sons of the Herodian royal house still ruled over some portions of the Holy Land of the past and in other ways aroused hope by their life, this party did not appear to be without some prospects, insecure as its basis was. But the following history will sufficiently show how little they permanently accomplished. It was one of those uncertain and unstable eclectic movements, such as are readily formed, even in science and learning, from motives of prudent calculation in the course of periods of peace, and which at the first storm immediately fall again into their original inanity.

And at all events the other son of Herod who ruled over Galilee and Peræa, the Tetrarch *Antipas*—usually called in the New Testament, and also by Josephus, Herod (probably because he himself liked this more distinguished name best)—was not a man who the longer he reigned (and he reigned nearly forty-three years; accordingly beyond the period under notice) would the more have assisted this movement in favour of his house. In spite of timidity and a love of ease which increased with his years, he was very keenly active, and ready for everything when his power, and particularly adulation of the Emperor, were concerned. But ultimately he loved really only the world, with its honours, pleasures, and indulgences; and if he was obliged, from fear of complaints in Rome, to proceed much more cautiously than his father, he fell, on the other hand, early into all the greater liking for cunning, mixed with unwariness and covetousness, and to some extent into a but partially repressed cruelty, which became the more dangerous to him the longer he reigned; so that his melancholy end can create no surprise. Even Christ can designate him on the fitting occasion only as 'the fox;'[1] so much had a low astuteness and a timidly cunning covetousness become his deepest characteristics. What can be gathered from the New Testament regarding him accords in this chief respect perfectly with Josephus's accounts of him, notwithstanding the great difference there is in the matter which these two sources respectively have chiefly in view.

He paid his tribute to the passion of the age in the matter of building towns. The town *Sepphoris*, to the north-west of Tabor, which previously could be regarded as the chief town of

Pers. *Sat.* v. 180, comp. with my remarks on Ps. xxi. and note in *Commentary on the Prophets*, i. p 274.

[1] Luke xiii. 32.

Galilee,[1] but had been so sadly demolished in the wars which followed upon Herod's death,[2] he restored so magnificently that it was long looked upon as the most beautiful town of all Galilee, and remained as an important fortified place down to the Middle Ages, in fact exists in our own time as a village under the same name. It could serve on the north-east as a barrier against the Roman Cæsarea on the Sea;[3] but the Tetrarch arranged the town in such a heathen fashion that its inhabitants were always regarded in the following times of war as the best friends of Rome. Still he suffered it to retain its old name, whilst subsequent to the war of Bar-cocheba, in which without doubt it afresh splendidly proved its liking for Rome, it was distinguished by the name Diocæsarea, newly given to it.[4] Probably at the same time he began in Peræa to throw a wall around the ancient town Baeth-aramphtha,[5] on the eastern bank of the Jordan, a little to the north of the Dead Sea, situated in the fruitful plain. He named it *Julia Livia*, though it is often called Julias or Livias simply. In later years, when he supposed that he already stood high in the favour of Tiberius, but desired to stand still higher therein, he resolved to build also a *Tiberias*. For this purpose he selected a very fruitful district by the Lake of Galilee, a little to the north of the warm baths (Hammath, called by the Greeks *Emmaus*), which were famous in ancient times, probably because the site here was his own personal property, and he therefore supposed that he could build and arrange the new city quite to his own taste. But unexpectedly an extensive burying-ground was come upon in the spot chosen, without doubt part of the ruins of an old town that had been long abandoned.[6] This circumstance might easily have led to the complete abandonment of the undertaking, as, according to the traditionary feeling, even a possible contact

[1] Vol. v. p. 403, 436.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 453.

[3] *Ante*, p. 37.

[4] This name certainly did not arise before the second century: Josephus never uses it, and the first coin which bears it appears under Antoninus P., Mionnet, *Descrip. des Méd.* v. p. 483, suppl. viii. p. 331. We may, therefore, with safety draw the above inference.

[5] A Greek form of Baeth-haramtha, as Baeth-Haram is already called, Josh. xiii. 27 (according to which Baeth-Haran must be emended, Num. xxxii. 36).

[6] The later Talmudists supposed that the Rakkath belonging to Naphtali mentioned Josh. xix. 35, in conjunction with Hammath, was on this site; but if Josephus had known anything of a town previously situated here and still known, he would undoubtedly have mentioned the fact, as in all similar cases he does this, and speaks at such length precisely about the founding of Tiberias, *Ant.* xviii. 2. 3.—According to a statement in *Qontres ha-Massoreth* (edited by Dukes, Tübingen, 1846), p. 1, Tiberias was formerly called מְעוֹזִיָּה. This is a reminiscence of an entirely different kind; the question is only how the word is to be pointed (מָעוֹז יָהּ, *Refuge of God?*), and what is the age of this tradition (comp. Lebrecht's *Kritische Lese zum Talmûd*, p. 18). According to Euseb. *Chron.* ii. pp. 148, 209, of Schöne's new ed., the building of Tiberias and Livias took place in the fifteenth year of Tiberius.

with the bones of the dead was dreaded.[1] As a fact the settlement of the city would not make progress, and the Tetrarch was now compelled to employ every means at his command to procure permanent inhabitants for his new erection. He caused others than Galileans, indeed, a true medley of people, to settle there; compelled many of his dependent subjects, and in part officials, to locate themselves there; allowed even the poor from all countries—indeed, people of a questionable origin and doubtful freedom, to become citizens; and was necessitated notwithstanding to endeavour to retain his settlers by all kinds of special privileges and benefits—indeed, by grants of houses and lands. Moreover, he caused his own house in the city to be ornamented with representations of animals, contrary to the sacred law as it was then interpreted: an offence which the stricter Zealots of the Law were the less inclined to overlook in his case,[2] as he, quite unlike Philip,[3] really did not place effigies of the Cæsars on his coins.[4] However, the city nevertheless flourished at last, although the doctors of the Law succeeded in getting this provision, that every settler should be regarded as unclean the first seven days.[5] After the destruction of Jerusalem this limitation also fell into disuse, and in the end no Herodian city perpetuated by its long prosperity and durability its fame down to our own time as it has done.

What else we know of Antipas's deeds is somewhat uncertain in respect of date, inasmuch as Josephus, to whom we owe most of the information, omits here also, according to his usual custom, to mention accurately the years.

His wife was a daughter of the Arabian king Aretas, whose seat was at Petra, from whence his dominion extended far northwards, and his territories touched the entire southern and eastern boundaries of Peræa. As these Arab princes, as was above[6] shown more fully, had lived for centuries in very various conflict with the Judeans, and even Herod had, to his own

[1] See *Antiquities*, p. 149 sq. It remains a remarkable fact that the city is nowhere mentioned in the first three Gospels, and first occurs in the fourth: so far may many, Galileans particularly, have in those first years still avoided contact with the city except under necessity.

[2] Jos. *Life*, ch. xii.

[3] *Ante*, p. 72.

[4] After the manner of Philip, he put the word *Tiberias* in the middle of the reverse of some of his coins (most likely of those struck in Tiberias), but not an image of this city after the heathen manner. Comp. Eckhel's *Doct. Num.* i. p. 486; Cavedoni's *Biblische Numismatik*, ii. p. 34; Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage*, pp. 97–99. In the N. T. he is the more appropriately called briefly Herod, as he describes himself on his coins and inscriptions (comp. Franz, *Elem. Epigr. Gr.* p. 271) as the *Tetrarch Herod*, evidently because Archelaus had called himself, acc. vol. v. p. 449, the *Ethnarch Herod*. We see from this that these sons of Herod were as eager to call themselves Herod as the successors of Cæsar were to call themselves Cæsar.

[5] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2. 3.

[6] Vol. v. pp. 350 sq.

great cost, met with their hostility in his later years, nothing could be more desirable for his son, the Tetrarch, and for Palestine generally, than this family alliance. In this direction also the more universal repose which prevailed through the Roman Empire, was in this way confirmed. But after this union had lasted a considerable time, Antipas on one occasion undertook a journey by way of Jerusalem to Rome, on business which he had to transact there, took up his quarters in Jerusalem at the house of his half-brother Herod, who was living there as a rich man, and was the only son of Herod who bore this name from the first.[1] He here fell in love with Herod's wife Herodias—indeed, promised to marry her and to divorce his Arab wife on his return from Rome. This Herodias was a daughter[2] of the Aristobulus whom Herod the Great had so cruelly slain,[3] and Berenice, the daughter of Herod's sister Salome, it being a habit of the Herods to intermarry. In character she was only a worse copy of her great-grandmother, the Asmonean mother-in-law of Herod the Great, excessively proud and ambitious of rule like Alexandra, but also at the same time not inclined to shun ignoble means; just as in the present instance it was manifestly only from ambition to become the wife of a Tetrarch that she could be led astray to the unlawful thought of promising to marry the half-brother of her husband, and thus commit adultery in two ways. Whilst the Tetrarch, however, was still in Rome, his lawful wife came to hear of his intentions, without letting him see that she was aware of them, begged permission to make a visit of pleasure to Machærus, the southern border-fortress between Peræa and the territory of her father,[4] while she had also secretly previously so arranged

[1] Acc. Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 1, 4, comp. xvii. 1. 3, and the remarks above, p. 69, on the two sons of Herod who were not princes. It is true Mark, vi. 17, names the Tetrarch Philip (for no other could then be thought of) instead of this Herod; but acc. p. 72, Philip had another wife, and it would be more natural that Herodias should be thus led astray if her husband was not a prince. The confusion in Mark arose the more easily as this Herod was, acc. Jos. xvii. 1. 3, a brother of Philip, and the wives of both were, acc. p. 72, mother and daughter; so that in a certain respect Philip was involved in the matter, and could appear as a plaintiff. It looks, too, like an intentional correction of the Gospel of Mark, when both Luke iii. 19 and Matt. xiv. 3 (according to the better manuscripts, in both passages), the name Philip is omitted. The daughter of Herodias mentioned in these passages of the Gospels was undoubtedly by her first husband, and probably died early, as Josephus passes her over.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 4; comp. vol. v. p. 439.

[3] Vol. v. p. 444.

[4] *Ant.* xviii. 5. 1, the sense would be, according to the former reading, that this town was *then* subject to the Arabian king; but that is contrary to the statement of Josephus himself in the following sect., 2, and the fact is itself improbable, according to the origin of this fortress, vol. v. p. 382. But it has now been perceived that an error must have crept into the text. J. Bekker reads τὸν τῷ instead of τότε, but στρατηγὸν must be inserted

everything, that the moment she entered this fortress she was received by an officer of her father's, and her further flight to her father at Petra effected. Unfortunately Josephus does not supply more precisely the date of this event, which is important on account of the Gospel history also; on the contrary, he connects it too closely with the war which at last arose out of it.

The course of events was as follows: As a matter of course, the Tetrarch had thereby completely thrown away the peace with Aretas, and put into his hand the righteous pretext for demanding strict satisfaction. But without doubt there was first a good deal of negotiating to and fro between the two princes, particularly as the Romans also were greatly interested in the matter. In these negotiations a couple of years may very well have passed. The Tetrarch, however, married Herodias at once, and she continued to completely enchain his affections. Neither the sullen discontent of his people nor the open censure of John the Baptist availed to bring him back to the right path; indeed, it is known how at last he got rid of this blameless preacher of repentance.[1] As at last both sides had exhausted themselves in negotiations and words, arms were resorted to. The Arabian now demanded a considerable district on the north-western boundary of his country, not far from the town of Gamala, situated on the south-east of the Lake of Galilee. The war was, however, conducted somewhat inactively by the two commanders only, after Aretas had rejected the Roman mediation, which had been, as it appears, offered to him under serious threats. But the decisive battle at last fell out to the disadvantage of the Tetrarch, as it is related, through an act of treachery on the part of the wretched rabble, which, when driven out of Philip's principality, had been received into the army of Antipas; and at all events such loose mobs were to be found, even at that time, amongst those small border-nations.

This battle occurred at latest in the year 34, while the Tetrarch Philip was still living.[2] John the Baptist also had

in order to supply the reference of *ὑποτελῆ*. The princess had secretly sent on before to Machærus, as her marshal, a chief who had been in office at the court of Antipas, but was tributary to Aretas on account of landed property, and this officer had arranged everything so well with the Nabatean chief that she passed from one hand quite safely into the other. This is plainly the meaning of the account, comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, p. 177 sq. As regards the locality of this fortress on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea, see *infra*.

[1] See *infra*.

[2] As can be inferred with perfect certainty from the words *οἵ ὄντες ἐκ τῆς Φιλίππου τετραρχίας*, *Ant.* xviii. 5. 1. The fact that the death of Philip was previously related, xviii. 4. 6, does not alter the clear meaning of these words. It must be noted that Josephus in the first

evidently fallen not so very long before, since not a few amongst the people ascribed the unfavourable issue of the war to the innocent blood of the Baptist, which the Tetrarch had shed.[1] Roman help was now indispensable, inasmuch as if the Arabians followed up their victory they would have been able to overrun all Palestine and many parts of Syria. And this help was all the more necessary after Philip's principality had been incorporated with Syria.[2] As a fact, after all Roman negotiations with the defiant Arab prince had proved fruitless, Tiberius commissioned the 'Rector' of Syria and the rest of the East, L. Vitellius,[3] to inflict severe punishment upon him. But at that time the care and attention of the Roman general in Syria were variously preoccupied, amongst other things by the Parthian affairs as well as by the growing dissatisfaction in Palestine with Pilate's government, so that an immediate war of annihilation against Aretas was not to be thought of.

It is probable that for reasons of this kind Vitellius did not come either to Samaria or to Jerusalem, before the year 36, to examine the charges which we have seen[4] were laid against Pilate. It happened to be the Passover when he came; and as he had a brilliant reception from the people, he showed himself very gracious with regard to their requests. He remitted the tax on market-produce which had been levied by the Romans until that time,[5] and granted to the high priest the free use constantly of his official adornments.[6] The high-priest Caiaphas, who had always been on a good footing with Pilate,[7] but had long lost the respect of the people, he deposed at their request, and transferred the office to a certain Jonathan, son of Hanan, from whom, however, he withdrew it again in the following year, in order to confer it on his brother Theophilus.[8] He then went back to Antioch; but he seems soon to have gone from there to the Euphrates, to a peaceful meeting with the Parthian king Artabanus, and, after successful negotiations with reference to previous disputes with the Romans, he received from this Parthian his son Darius as a hostage and

instance (xviii. 3. 1–4. 3) makes the government of Pilate the subject of his narrative, inasmuch as he properly starts from Jerusalem; that then first, after he has mentioned the Parthian affairs (4. 6), does he pass to the death of Philip, to close (5. 1 sq.), with the history of Antipas, who died last. This is plainly the material order which he observes in this case; the chronological order of the various events has to be supplied by the reader. Dr. Keim's view of this whole matter, as stated in his *Geschichtlicher Christus* (3rd ed. pp. 227–240), is based on groundless suppositions.

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 2.
[2] Acc. p. 72, *ante*.
[3] P. 70.
[4] P. 70.
[5] See *ante*, p. 42.
[6] See *ante*, p. 40.
[7] See *ante*, p. 64.
[8] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4. 3; 5. 3.

pledge of future peace. Among the Parthian presents which were sent to the Roman emperor is mentioned as a marvel a Babylonian Jew, Eleazar, seven feet in stature. The Tetrarch accompanied the Roman Proconsul on this mission of peace, entertained the two chief personages in a brilliant manner upon a bridge thrown over the Euphrates, and took care not to leave the Emperor uninformed of all the success of the negotiations. Indeed, his information arrived before that sent by Vitellius himself, which almost cost him the favour of the latter.[1]

At the commencement of the year 37 Vitellius received from the Emperor the strict command to carry out the war against Aretas, after the Arabian had in the meantime extended his conquests even as far as Damascus, to the painful humiliation of the Romans.[2] The Roman general collected for this purpose a large army of Roman soldiers and allies. The Arab king remained very defiant, and afterwards it was related that in his confident courage he recklessly prophesied that no enemy would force his way to Petra, because one of three principal persons responsible for the war would soon fall. Vitellius advanced with his army from Antioch to Ptolemais,[3] and proposed to strike across to Petra by the most direct road by Judea, Jerusalem, and the south of the Dead Sea. There was then sent from Jerusalem to meet him a very earnest deputation, with the petition that he would spare the district of the Holy City the march through it, on account of the Roman eagles.[4] He yielded, and proposed to cross the Jordan, directing his march through the great plain between Galilee and Samaria. But, nevertheless, in company with the Tetrarch and a few intimate friends, he honoured Jerusalem with a visit, and was again received there with great splendour. Indeed, as a feast (either Easter or Pentecost) was at hand, he promised to himself present a sacrifice at it. However, on the fourth day of his stay there, he received the news of the death of Tiberius, administered to the army the oath of allegiance to Caius, and, probably not unwillingly, abandoned the campaign for which he had now no authority.[5] A tolerable arrangement appears to have afterwards ended the contention, of which we must speak subsequently.[6]

[1] Acc. Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4. 4 sq.; comp., as regards Vitellius, Suet. *Vitell.* ch. ii. and Tac. *Ann.* vi. 41–44, where, however, on account of the great hiatus at the close of lib. vi. the end of the above history is wanting.

[2] On this important episode, see further, vol. vi. [German].

[3] Vol. v. p. 236.

[4] See *ante*, p. 65.

[5] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 3; at this point in Tacitus the hiatus occurs.

[6] Vol. vi. [German].

Antipas remained, meantime, without children. On this account it was to be expected that this last remnant of the kingdom of Herod would soon become directly Roman. It is true that from the time of Augustus there had also existed all along in the neighbourhood a few small principalities not directly dependent on Rome, as in Chalkis or Abila;[1] in Emesa, on the northern slope of the Lebanon, under King Sampsigeramus, to whose daughter a younger member of the Herodian family was married;[2] in Cappadocia and in Cilicia.[3] But the principles which prevailed in Rome were unfavourable to the continuance of such governments of 'allies,' and all such vassal-governments were gradually absorbed into the one empire of Rome.

3. *The Members of the Ancient Nation in Heathen Countries.*

With regard to the numerous dispersed members of the nation in heathen cities and countries, their position and their lot remained in general the same as was described in the previous volume; but it is implied in the nature of the mutual relations thus formed, as they have already been there discussed, that their essential incompatibility, even during this generally peaceful period, could not be concealed, and that at least certain striking indications thereof should break out. We can observe this most plainly in that quarter where the light of history is for us at this time the brightest, that is, in in the Roman empire.

We saw in the previous volume how favourably Cæsar and then Augustus were disposed towards the Judeans and Samaritans, and that they were well able to use the favourable opportunity to their own advantage. Tiberius gladly perpetuated in a similar way that which his predecessors had in this respect begun. He zealously promoted everywhere particularly peace, trade, and manufactures, and discountenanced internal discord. During the first half of his reign especially he kept a strict watch over the governors of all the provinces. Accordingly, this period before us of thirty years was in general a truly prosperous age for the widely-scattered Dispersion, in which their intercourse and wealth grew in all directions. Moreover, their religion also was not only left in peace amongst

[1] Vol. v. p. 404, comp. further in vol. vi. [German].

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 4.

[3] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 42, 78; comp. vi. 41, from which it appears that in *Cilicia Tracheia* also, in the year 36 A.D., a people just like the adherents of the Gaulonite, *ante*, p. 45 sq., revolted against the Romans, when, after the death of the King Archelaus, it was required to come directly under Rome and submit to a census,

all kinds of heathen, but it was also freely taught, and could be brought in various ways under the notice of the curious heathen. The best evidence of this is supplied by one of the immediate contemporaries, Philo of Alexandria, particularly in his book on the 'Legation to Caius.' For this loquacious writer undoubtedly exaggerates somewhat the praise to be accorded to Tiberius, and still more that to be accorded to Augustus, inasmuch as by exalting these emperors he could throw Caius still more into the shade. Still, the facts which he brings forward are not inventions, and the whole impression which the rule of these two emperors had made upon the Judeans of that time must have been a very favourable one. Thus he mentions, with high commendation, that Tiberius never claimed from the Judeans the least mark of divine worship for himself or for the Roman empire and the family of Cæsar.[1] However, such cautious abstention was everywhere manifested by this emperor, even in Rome and towards the Senate. Further, Philo mentions that he allowed the poor Judeans dwelling at Rome to share in the monthly distributions of money and corn which fell to the numerous poor of the city; indeed, that when the distribution chanced to fall on a Sabbath, he ordered it to be made on the next day, out of special consideration for them.[2] But when Philo remarks that Tiberius caused daily sacrifices to be presented for himself in the Temple at Jerusalem also, and thereby paid the highest honour to the Judean religion,[3] the sacrifices intended are undoubtedly only those which the Persian and Syrian kings had previously caused to be presented at the public cost.[4]

Nevertheless, these relations, which are extolled by Philo as so unexceptionally happy, began to be observably beclouded even at the commencement of the reign of Tiberius. At that time very many Judeans had long dwelt in Rome, settled in this central point of the world from very various causes. The largest number of them consisted of the descendants of those who had formerly come to Rome as public prisoners through the victories of Pompey and other Roman generals. As freedmen they had received a district across the Tiber as their locality,[5] and lived there mostly in the greatest poverty. Many of these and of the others who then flocked to Rome did not, on account of their

[1] *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xxxviii. sq.
[2] *Ibid.* ch. xxiii. (ii. p. 569).
[3] *Ibid.* ch. xxiii.
[4] Vol. v. p. 113.
[5] The same district into which later, after the victories of Titus, a much larger number of such captives were removed, and which is in our own time still regarded as the Jews' quarter (*il Ghetto*) of Rome. Comp. *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xxiii. (ii. p. 568) with vol. v. pp. 240, 401.

avocations, enjoy the best reputation. In their interpretation of the sacred antiquities of Mosaism particularly they did not always meet in the best way the curiosity of the Romans. For at that time all Romans, from the common people to the emperor, were smitten with the desire to occupy themselves with the singularities of the 'Judeans,' and, if possible, to present sacrifices themselves at Jerusalem, or, if that could not be, to get them presented for them.[1] Indeed, a universal longing to be initiated into the Oriental religions and mysteries had before that time taken possession of many Romans, particularly of many women, although the motives which produced this desire in individual cases were often anything but pure, and much vain curiosity, or still worse, was present. We shall have to speak further on this point in the next volume. Thus there came a Judean of bad reputation into the Imperial City, who had fled from Palestine on account of a transgression against the laws and from fear of further punishment. In Rome he professed publicly to be an interpreter of the Mosaic laws, or an exegete, and persuaded a noble lady, Fulvia, who had already been converted to the Mosaic religion, wife of a certain Saturninus, of Equestrian or Senatorial rank, to entrust to him purple and gold as an offering for the Temple. But the deceiver had previously concerted with three others to divide the treasures as soon as they got them into their power. The affair got abroad, and it was said that Saturninus himself had communicated it to the Emperor. As now at the same time there had also been loud complaints of still worse frauds on the part of the priests of Isis in Rome, and all these Oriental religions were as yet little distinguished from each other,[2] at the instigation of Tiberius, a severe resolution of the Senate was issued with regard to the 'Egyptian and Judean religions.'[3] According to this resolution, 4,000 of the younger men of such freedmen were to be forced into the military service (which was an abomination in the estimation of the Judeans[4]), and were to be sent to Sardinia (considered then one of the most unhealthy islands[5]),

[1] Suet. *Oct.* lxxvi., xciii., and the well-known witticisms of Horace (*Sat.* i. 4, 143 sq., and elsewhere), Persius (*Sat.* v. 180 sq.), Ovid (*Rem. Am.* 219 sq.) Comp. also Seneca, *De Superst.* (in Augustine's *De Civ. Dei*, vi. 11), who, however, here already, anticipating the manner of Tacitus, speaks of the *sceleratissima gens.*

[2] Manifestly owing to this confusion, Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 4, relates at length, before the Judean incident, § 5, the affair with the priests of Isis, who were even crucified in punishment of their serious frauds.

[3] It is necessary on this point to carefully take together the words of Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85, Suet. *Tib.* xxxvi., Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3. 5, and those of Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, ch. xxiv., in order to infer from them the real state of the case, and to fully understand the entire resolution of the Senate.

[4] See vol. v. p. 406.

[5] Whither subsequently many Chris-

to destroy the robbers there; all the rest, if they did not renounce their superstition by a certain day, were to be driven from Italy; the sacred garments and the rest of the holy utensils were to be burnt. This incident took place in the year 19, accordingly, before Sejanus had obtained his great influence over Tiberius; which makes Philo's idle talk about the Judeans having had to suffer this simply from the hatred of Sejanus all the more foolish. On the contrary, the Judeans were now for the first time, according to Roman legislation, classed together with the adherents of the Egyptian and Syrian religions, the frivolity of which Augustus had previously sought to banish from Rome by a similar law.[1] And undoubtedly the effect of such laws in hindering 'superstition' and its teachers was not very lasting this time either: however, similar prohibitions could the more easily be repeated.

We shall find subsequently a better opportunity of observing how the circumstances of the Babylonian Judeans also grew less favourable in these times. But in general several distinctions of greater significance between the dispersed descendants of the ancient nation who lived in the Roman and those who lived in the Parthian empire were still kept up from earlier times, and they were destined soon to become in the course of the subsequent times of greater importance. Those in the Roman Empire dwelt, it is true, in some localities nearer together, partly because they had in the last centuries been transplanted thither in large numbers as settlers or as prisoners, partly on account of the circumstances which were favourable to intercourse, as in Alexandria, Rome, Antioch, Thessalonica, Corinth; but in general they lived very much intermixed with the Gentiles, extending themselves in all directions, so that the name Dispersion, or *Diaspora*, was specially applicable to them.[2] On the other hand, those in the Parthian empire still continued to dwell closer together in certain localities, particularly those belonging to the great banishments of the Assyrian and Chaldean times, so that the Aramaic name *Gâlûth*, i.e. exile, still remained for this and much later times the usual one for them collectively.[3] As now Greek culture was, in the Eastern coun-

tians also were banished; comp. Hippol. *Philosophumena*, p. 287, Oxford edition. Romans also, whom it was desired very severely to punish, were not infrequently sent thither.

[1] Dio Cassius, *Hist.* liv. 6.

[2] Comp. ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, John vii. 35, comp. xii. 20; whence the phrases Jam. i. 1 1 Pet. i. 1, although transferred to the Christian society, are sufficiently explained.

[3] This name continued very constant, particularly in accordance with the usage of it in Ezekiel and "Isa." xlv. 13; that the exile was at all events originally a *compulsory* one, follows of itself from the feeling of ancient nations in this respect.

tries, since the overthrow of the Seleucidæ and the supremacy of the Roman rule, gradually driven back, and the hostility between the East and the West of the world of that time grew more pronounced, the Judeans in these two great halves of that world also assumed increasingly dissimilar forms of mental development. Much more of ancient learning and scholastic knowledge, as well as of antique customs and maxims of life, remained in the East; much freer movement and fresher originality of life were indigenous amongst the Judeans in the wide empire of the West with its infinite variety, and could not, down to this time, be much repressed under the imperial rule. Still, the Temple in Jerusalem, common to both, with all the other sacred things of Israel, had hitherto united the two great halves of the dispersed nation of the true religion which were about to separate ever wider from each other. And almost exactly midway between them there dwelt constantly the nucleus of a true nation, which, in spite of all its already half-completed dispersion and its manifold disruption, included within it still a sufficiency of pure energy and pure courage.

The Condition and the Hope of the Nation in the Sacred Land of its Fathers.

For it cannot be ignored that the most recent Roman period also contributed largely to the still further confusion and crippling of the whole spirit of the nation generally in the ancient sacred land itself, and to a still worse demoralisation of some classes and sections of it. The rent in the sanctuary of so many hearts which was made by the Roman rule at the very first, and which the forcible repression of the rising of the Gaulonite[1] could not heal, was too deep to admit of its being closed, even by the long peace of these days; and in the midst of this long peace there were nevertheless perpetually fresh national embroilments and animosities of the worst kind. For this subjugation under the sword of the heathen the better portion of the nation sought comfort solely in the consciousness of its spiritual superiority and in its Messianic hope. The desire to teach and to convert the heathen, which had commenced long before,[2] now revived with fresh zeal and found in the peace of the wide Roman empire all the greater scope. But these undertakings, so far as they were prosecuted with some conscious purpose, undoubtedly proceeded mainly from

[1] *Ante*, p. 53.

[2] See vol. v. pp. 27, 33, 173.

Jerusalem and from the Pharisees.[1] We see, however, from the writings of Philo, how zealously the Judeans who dwelt more closely crowded together in Alexandria also cultivated and boasted of the freer culture of the mind. But the results of the endeavour to convert the heathen remained all along comparatively insignificant; and the Hagiocracy was little able by its own efforts at home to educate its children so as to make them perfect members of a community based on true religion. Thus the best national energies, even in many of the better members of Israel, as it still continued to exist, grew rigid and obdurate, or embittered and poisoned, in the very midst of this long peace; and all the forces of impure religion which had displayed themselves from early times and which sought to become dominant, could the more rampantly flourish in the oppressive, swampy atmosphere of this age.

The poisonous influences which seem to gather over a calamitous time, or over a nation which has long been declining, often in the most surprising manner break out even in diseases and weaknesses, which, when once they have anywhere taken firmer hold, are difficult to eradicate. At the beginning of this long national history, Israel suffered, in consequence of the calamitous Egyptian times, from a detestable disease which touched only the skin.[2] In a similar manner we see now, towards the end of this history, suddenly a new terrible disease appearing, affecting both the soul and the body, and mysteriously clinging to not a few members of the nation. This is (to give it this name) the *disease of demons*, the most marked sign of the dark aspect of this time. In this disease the dread of evil spirits, which was of much earlier date,[3] had, in conjunction with the confusion and soured temper of this period and with all the other profound disturbances of the mind of this people, grown into one most obscure and grievous calamity, and now meets us in the most horrible form. It is as if all the most enigmatical mental sufferings of the nation, as it was already growing old, took bodily shape in the crowds of demoniacs who now appear scattered through all parts of the country and in the villages as well as the towns. But if these sufferings are earlier as regards the elements from which they arose, and probably not absent even amongst the neighbouring nations about that time, as a disease they were now first fully developed, and as such it shows itself nowhere else more deeply rooted than in that nation whose spirit had long become most sensitive precisely in every purely emotional experience as re-

[1] Matt. xxiii. 15: we shall have to speak further on this point in the next

[2] Vol. ii. p. 80.

[3] Vol. v. p. 184.

gards right and wrong religious relations.[1] But in the demoniacs it is scarcely possible any more to see members of the people of God: so low do they seem to have sunk and so completely to have forgotten everything of the true God, or rather to be forgotten of Him. The separation of the realm of spirits into the two of good and evil angels has now been made complete; but that so many could now surrender themselves without resistance to the belief of being under the absolute dominion of evil spirits, and thereby fall into increasing misery, is a sign of the great spiritual confusion and helplessness, indeed, of the vast general misery and degeneracy of this age.

Of the condition of the people at that time in the chief towns of the various districts of the country we know but little, and can speak definitely with regard to Jerusalem only. In this capital the people were, it is true, no longer dependent on the influences and humours of a royal court; and the Roman governor rarely came thither. But there had then long existed, in the great mother-community of all native and foreign Judeans, a learned school for the exegesis of the Sacred Scriptures and for the study of the Law,[2] of which we can now only with difficulty form a more than general idea. However, the estimation in which the school was held and the influence it exerted were, according to all indications, very great. Probably it was but rarely that it came into unfriendly collision with the Hagiocracy; without doubt it generally gave its adhesion to the intentions and resolves of the Hagiocracy, by which it could acquire great power, although it thereby also involved itself in all the exceedingly dangerous errors and wrong courses of the latter. Accordingly it exercised hardly any different influence upon both the people generally, and particularly upon the people of the great capital, from that of the Hagiocracy itself. And the more independent the people in the proud capital were of all the influences of a royal court, the more dependent were they upon the Hagiocracy, which had in that city its only seat and now had a more illustrious position than ever before. The Hagiocracy had now become, next to the Sacred Scriptures, the

[1] This point is further discussed subsequently in this volume, as well as in my essay on the Demoniac of Gergesa, *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* vii. p. 54 sq. [Comp. now the author's last work, *Gott und die Bibel*, § 221.—Tr.]

[2] Indicated by such passages as Luke ii. 46, Mark iii. 22, vii. 1, John vii. 15, and by many other evidences, even by the very existence and great significance of the γραμματεῖς and νομικοί, comp. *ante*, p. 9, vol. v. pp. 489 sq.; such names as Rabbi also (see *infra*) can only be explained by its existence. Nor could new learned schools have arisen in so many places, immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, if a great school of this kind had not previously existed in Jerusalem, and many customs undoubtedly were retained from this earlier school in the far poorer institutions of the later generations.

sole pride and defence of the nation in this phase of its history; and it ruled under the exclusive supreme supervision of the Romans with all the greater freedom from the fact that the Roman government was disinclined to meddle with the peculiar religion of this nation. The Hagiocracy had the control of all the sacred institutions in Jerusalem; and all the rich presents and offerings which flowed together around the Temple out of all countries of the world,[1] from the settled or scattered Judeans and to no small extent from pious heathen, passed through their hands. Thus a great portion of the population of the capital were dependent, directly or indirectly, upon the power, the wealth, and the good-will of the heads of this Hagiocracy; and from the rich sacrifices of the Temple, the feasts solemnised in connection with it, and the money of the crowds of foreign visitors, there fell such seductive advantages upon the resident population that they necessarily became constantly more dependent on the Hagiocracy, just as this was the case for centuries with Papal Rome and is still the case with Mecca.

The Hagiocracy, in the stereotyped and unchangeable form which it had now assumed, and with its sense of security, was unable to awaken any deep religious impression in those people who were immediately connected with it and derived from it material advantages. On the other hand, it had become, through the form and authority of the laws and institutions which formed the sphere of its movements for some centuries, itself more and more dependent on the school of the learned interpreters of the Sacred Scriptures and the experts of the Law; and it was precisely this school which was then at the height of its prosperity. We can thus understand that the chief pride and also the most perilous arrogance and the most obdurate infatuation of those days found a climax in this school of the Biblical scholars. They could imagine that for this late age they possessed the true seat of Moses, and on that account perpetuated his rule.[2] They saw the common people, no less than the men of high-priestly and priestly rank, living and acting according to their interpretation and understanding of the ancient sacred laws of this kingdom of the true God. And after the rising of the Gaulonite had been put down, this school alone remained standing erect in its extensive sphere of

[1] See vol. v. p. 173. The passage here cited, Mal. i. 11, which is so often incorrectly understood, expresses properly nothing else than that already in heathen countries there were many who esteemed the true religion, the presents of whom flowed to the Temple, and, although not customary offerings, were nevertheless regarded there as 'quite a pure offering.' Comp. *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* viii. p. 162.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 2 sq., and the words Enoch xcix. 2, civ. 10, allude to similar adulterations of the sacred Law by the scholars.

labour, irradiated by the splendour of an unusually profound knowledge, and as it were invested with an inviolable sanctity. The school accordingly boasted that the Judeans, with their sacred books, which were reliably interpreted and accessible to every man, and with their enduring sacred laws and obligations, possessed a religion such as no other nation enjoyed, a religion so perfectly true and in itself so unchangeable from the earliest times, and also so familiar and dear to all members of the community alike.[1] But a truly living religion, capable of overcoming the evils of the time, could not become prevalent through their agency. Accordingly there was soon developed in their midst an all the more haughty contempt of the common people as 'not knowing the law,'[2] a contempt scarcely repressed and moderated somewhat by the prudence and caution of the profession, or by the superior wisdom of individuals of the profession. It is true, that in one feeling of greatest practical effect the Hagiocracy were now in complete agreement with the mass of the people, both of the settled inhabitants of Palestine and of the Dispersion generally. This feeling was the unconditional reverence of the sacred national memories, of a great past history, of the sacred books, and of everything connected with them. This is, indeed, precisely the great characteristic feature which appears everywhere through all these last centuries of the existence of the ancient nation, and in which at this time pre-eminently all sections and parties of the people most readily meet in complete sympathy. Thus in these long years of tranquillity splendid monuments were willingly erected in honour of the ancient national prophets, heroes, and martyrs; their graves were looked for with a wholly new zeal and adorned with every mark of deep reverence;[3] as Herod had already acted in a similar case.[4] In this respect also this late age appeared to seek to return to the beginning of the entire history. Nevertheless, how little did the real spirit of those early heroes of Israel live in the hearts of those who took most pains to honour them with external honour!

Notwithstanding, there all along existed in the nation generally, as it dwelt in the sacred land of its fathers, very many uncorrupted and healthy elements, which this long peace only permitted once more to attain new vigour. Where the true religion has been once in force from ancient times as the

[1] Jos. *Contra Ap.* i. 8, ii. 18–20.

[2] See *ante*, p. 27.

[3] Matt. xxiii. 29–31, Luke xi. 47, 48. Whether, and which of, the remaining ancient erections of Jerusalem and of the rest of the Holy Land originated at this time deserves to be more particularly investigated.

[4] Vol. v. p. 435.

highest law, and is, moreover, as at that time, even under the Hagiocracy, constantly held up with so much zeal before the whole nation as the one means of salvation for priests and laity alike, it may well there in a thousand places silently produce its beneficial effects even against the will of the rulers, and can hardly ever permit the whole nation to fall into ruin. Far from the capital and the trading towns,[1] there was always dwelling still a firm nucleus of the people leading simpler and less artificial lives. Amid the toils of the increased demands of the age, they were, notwithstanding, as a rule, well educated by means of the careful instruction on the Sabbaths, which had then been widely spread from previous times. Nor did they fail to share enthusiastically in either the exalted ancient memories or the peculiar hope of Israel. Moreover, in Jerusalem itself and in the literary circles, there were undoubtedly always to be found here and there individuals who were not only well-educated and prepared to receive all higher truth, but were also longingly hoping for a final fulfilment of the ancient hope of the nation. Such, for instance, as that Simeon, who was in his advanced age rejuvenated by this hope, and that Anna, Phanuel's daughter, on whom the prophetic afflatus descended, whose memory has been by accident preserved from this time;[2] or as we see such hopes once more revived in this very time in the book of the *Assumption of Moses*.[3]

It is also not to be denied that the whole condition of the people once more took a more hopeful form during these thirty years, so that not a few individuals were able to hope for still better things in the future if there was a continuous advance in the same course. After the fatal collision with the Romans, which was threatened at the very commencement, had been rendered less injurious before it was too late, and the first violent outbreak of Zealotism had been conducted into a quieter channel, the prosperity of the people had been increased in the shelter of peace even under the Roman rule. Moreover, the nation had really won spiritual victories over the Romans, by both its patience and its tenacity in well-considered petition and representation; and this could not fail to increase in no small degree its self-consciousness. Indeed, these victories, it was felt, might gradually become more and more victories of the true

[1] As was previously remarked, vol. v. p. 460.

[2] Luke ii. 25–38. A narrative of a somewhat free character, but one which by no means originated without an historical basis. On the other hand, the story of the Magi, Matt. ii. 1–18, could not have arisen unless a reminiscence had been preserved of the fact that the Judeans in the distant east also followed with greatest interest precisely at that time the course of the ancient hope of Israel.

[3] See *ante*, p. 55.

religion over the heathenism which now ruled the world as never before; and step by step this increased self-consciousness might have sought with increasing energy to attain the final object of the community of the true religion.

But after all we are compelled to say, that if the history of the people of Israel in this last great phase had been continued simply as we have just seen it unfolding in the first of the three portions of it, the whole of this last period would have then conducted to nothing else than to the final and perpetual ruin of this people, and a ruin in which the higher blessings which lay concealed in it and its past history would have gradually been wasted and lost. For though it is true that the teaching and practical tendencies of the Gaulonite—which, as we have seen, embodied the true logical outcome, and, as regards foreign governments, the greatest power of the Hagiocracy, just as the latter was the same embodiment of the entire past history of Israel—had been with their spreading and devouring fire completely kept down at the moment of their first violent repression; on the other hand, the profounder tendencies and spirit from which they had sprung had not been crushed by the fall of the Gaulonite. On the contrary, this spirit and these tendencies constituted precisely the life-breath of the spiritual history of all these centuries. They made themselves gradually felt once more also in what seemed the most modest demands and the most patient petitions, as we saw in the history of Pilate,[1] inasmuch as the tenacious demand not to be compelled so much as to see possible images of heathenism, at all events not within the Holy City and its district, ultimately originates in them. And they were always only waiting for the favourable time to break out in the wildest fire and to seize with consuming force the whole nation in a terrible struggle upon native and foreign soil. The lamentable progress of the history will soon show this. Moreover, the total annihilation of the nation in the final collision with the Roman power must have at the same time annihilated all the higher treasures which were contained in it and its two thousand years of toil and conflict for the true religion, because they were still too closely interwoven with its nationality, and, indeed, had in the course of its past development got more and more amalgamated with that nationality on account of the severe struggle to protect its very existence against the other nations. For in this respect something like a real enchantment has taken effect, which seemed to limit as by a charm the possession and enjoyment of the truths of the

[1] *Ante*, p. 66.

higher religion to the nationality of Israel, while this nationality itself had nevertheless, with all that was based upon it, at last to disappear with the nation itself if the immortal treasures which it contained were to be rescued in a purer and more perfect form. Otherwise individual members of the nation might have here and there escaped from the national destruction which was now so impending, but in that case there would only have been a repetition of what is observed with regard to the peculiar doctrines and religions of the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Parsees, and similar ancient nations of higher culture. These doctrines and religions were preserved for a considerable time amongst the dwindled and melancholy remnants of these nations, but only in the end to perish more and more completely. Or we should have had a repetition of the case of those Jews who, whether before or after the rise of Christianity, had found their way into further eastern Asia, into China, and elsewhere. There, far from Christianity, they developed in their isolation no spiritual activity at all worth the name, and down to the present time have been more and more hopelessly dying out. The consummation of the true religion and the great reward of the entire two thousand years of the best endeavour and struggle of this nation would have been missed; and just as the most promising blossoms and fruit fall uselessly to the ground if they are not brought to perfection, so also in this highest instance all the spiritual treasures which had long ago been gained would have been lost again, if their perfect consummation had not come at the right time to secure their lasting duration and their continual future increase.

At this point, therefore, there arises first a series of most important questions, which are here proposed not only by this period of thirty years and the remainder of the last advance of Israel's history, but also ultimately by this entire history, and here towards its close most pointedly. Everything tends with irresistible force to a conclusion of the past course of development and to a new reconstruction, because the best members of the Community must themselves feel more or less clearly how near and inevitably the final destruction is hanging over the head of this Community, unless it should yet in time be rejuvenated and enter upon a completely new and a better course. But such a rejuvenation and reconstruction of the ancient Community of the true religion, completely satisfying the profoundest needs, could not be effected within the midst of sacred limits except under special conditions. The nation in its ancient character had now already passed through all the

forms possible to it, had attempted everything, and fought through almost everything, in order to find itself in a position where the whole world, in a high state of development, confronts it, and it must either spiritually succumb absolutely or rise anew with a power hitherto wholly unknown—indeed, scarcely suspected to exist. The condition of the successful accomplishment of such a reconstruction was, therefore, that it must be effected by the display of greater power, and on a larger scale, than had sufficed for the previous developments. Even the party of the Gaulonite, if it had finally succeeded, would have necessarily thrown all human affairs at that time into another form, particularly with reference to the Roman power, as must be further shown below. Was there, then, anything better than this party of the Gaulonite—anything, indeed, which would satisfy the requirements of this thorough and absolute separation of the world's ages and tendencies?—something which was so rooted in the deepest foundations of what was ancient that from it, in the sharp collision with what was now necessary, and as from the closest amalgamation of both impulses, the germ of a new life might be produced, which should be no less a perfectly new and powerful creation in opposition to the world than the true consummation of what was old? And if anything of this kind really existed, what was it when more closely considered, and what was the new element which had to be added to it? And how must the two elements—the old and the new—if they began to move and seek amalgamation, accomplish the union in the proper manner, and enter the world by the production of the new germ? Such questions of highest significance, properly to propose which is already a good part of their correct answer, at once present themselves to historical inquiry; and the whole course of the following history, if properly understood, is essentially simply the answer to them.

It is plainly quite clear that it is not so much many and various things which are still wanting, if the germ of the consummation is to be mysteriously formed and boldly come to light. It is only one final thing which was lacking: a new spirit which should no less irresistibly than correctly and successfully unite all those innumerable separate and scattered elements which had already been gained in the Community of the true religion as an immortal possession, and make of them the thing which was now needed and was really already implied in the logical outcome of the 2,000 years of the past history of this Community. It was only this one thing that was wanting, but this was also the most dark and mysterious thing

when it came to be more closely inquired after, and the most difficult thing when the attempt had to be made to execute it with a firm hand. And nevertheless a life is never prepared so as to become truly receptive for perhaps a new and still higher life, unless the healthy and vigorous conditions for it have already been developed within it. This holds here also in the highest instance which we can historically study. And accordingly we must now, in the first place, more particularly consider

The Previous Conditions of the Germination of the Seed of the Consummation.

The First Condition: the Inner Need of the True Consummation.

We have seen in the course of the previous volumes of this history how certain it is that Jahvéism, when it first goes forth into the wide world, already contains within itself the full commencement, and therefore the indestructible germ, of the true religion and its Community in the conscious antithesis to untrue religion. We have seen that this true religion is such that whenever it only puts forth its energies fully and continuously, it must necessarily, sooner or later, endeavour to attain its own perfect consummation. We have seen that, inasmuch as Jahvéism contains the immovable bases of such a true religion, it is valid alike for all men and nations; and was, simply on account of the limitations and necessities of the time in the first instance, more closely identified with this one nation, until, making itself a home in it, and there growing, it became its pride, possession, and its highest good in such an exceptional manner that the life and perpetuation upon earth of Jahvéism appeared to be inseparably bound up with that of this people. We have seen, on the one hand, that, mainly for the very reason that Jahvéism was provisionally confined to this one nation, although it was properly destined by its inmost instincts and tendencies to become the possession of the world, both new and more serious errors grew up in it, and also the imperfections, whether they were excrescences or weaknesses, which had from the very first been but too partially cast off, were still further developed. But, on the other hand, we have seen also those errors and imperfections thus far simply becoming developed and evident in order that they might at the right time be always overcome by the immovable basis of deeper truth and highest endeavour which had been here supplied from the beginning, newly obtained and higher truths being always

thus established upon this basis to make good the defects which still cleaved to this true but as yet not perfect religion. The entire past history of Israel, of nearly 2,000 years, together with all its widely rampant and varied offshoots and its almost innumerable details, had, after all, in essential matters, followed one simple line of development. With regard to that which is in this history the first thing, and always remains the highest, we find it unfolded and continued by one thread, so strong that it could not be broken, indeed, always getting stronger by means of all hindrances; until here, at last, the history has arrived at its mightiest hindrance, where the thread of development must either break or become immeasurably stronger and firmer.

The Theocracy, that is, the true religion as existing and working in a community, in the superabundant energy of its early youth, as it had in Israel just come forth victoriously from the conflict with a heathenism owing its supremacy to monarchy, had regarded even every form of human monarchy as incompatible with a theocracy; and it had subsisted in this exalted simplicity through all the first centuries of its history. So securely founded and imposingly strong was it in even this its *first* form. It had then, in order to maintain its place amongst the nations of the earth, in its *second* phase, learnt to reconcile itself with a human monarchy, and to maintain itself under every form of human government, even the most rigorous and hostile; indeed, to perceive for the first time the immeasurable advantages which the true human king might bring. But in this most powerful, and in its relations to the other nations most successful, form, which the Theocracy could assume as it had become nationalised in this particular nation, a special fault had been permitted to develop itself which was so exceedingly natural to it and had cleaved to it from its earliest youth. This fault was that of violence on the part of both kings and prophets, which showed itself nationally in both domestic and foreign relations. The tendencies to violence and the blows which were inflicted by it destroyed at the midday of this entire history that earthly commonwealth in which the Theocracy had been provisionally shut up, exactly at the time when this commonwealth seemed to have become most powerful and indestructible. It was thus taught that true religion can only in conjunction with the highest and purest love bring that perfect consummation which disappeared just as it was most intensely striven after in the form which the Theocracy had up to that time assumed. The true religion, with the Kingdom of God, as far as it is identical with it, was now maintained in

the *third* great phase of its history even amidst the ruin of the home which was its national shelter, and had, indeed, become its sacred abode. So deep a place had it now taken in the heart and will of an innumerable number of its individual children, and thus beneficial to it does even this outward destruction of a dwelling-place, in which it could not in any case always remain shut up, prove. Nevertheless, although now invincible for all time as regards the heathen, the true religion had not as yet sufficiently collected and consolidated its energies, owing to the fact that hitherto its activity had been directed with most vigour abroad against the heathen; it had not as yet sufficiently secured its own great and numerous treasures, which had now been won; neither had it yet cast off its own serious defects, though it had begun to perceive them; and it is conscious, therefore, in the midst of the growingly urgent call to attain its own consummation, that after all it lacks the true inward power to do this. Accordingly once more, upon its ancient native soil, it collects its forces from the outward national ruin and dispersion, as if to begin, and attempt more and more earnestly, a new regenerated life; here in its own land it seeks to recover what is still wanting, and by fresh inward growth and invigoration to prepare itself gradually for the consummation which is more and more needed and longed for, although its coming is still deferred. But when the true religion thus begins to grasp its ancient truths with all decision, and retreats ever further into its own sacred antiquity, it causes the Theocracy to become a Hagiocracy, it is itself by degrees lost in comparison with the dazzling and massive importance of the latter, and has now fully to learn how dangerous the overestimate of its own ancient and hallowed customs, opinions, and writings is, and that this is nothing other than to grow hardened and ossified in the possession of an ancient truth. And under this new and serious confusion and stagnation, it is unable either to gain the few important powers and capacities which it lacks, or to attain the consummation to which it now after all energetically strives, and which must come if the true religion shall not perish without result.

This is in brief the thread of the whole past history, until it now at last arrives here, as we saw above, at the hardest knot of entanglement and hindrance. It follows from this, in the first instance, that the true religion, from the time it began to exist and to operate upon the earth, always really sought a higher form transcending that already attained, and demanded its own consummation, precisely because it was not as yet the

perfect though the true religion, nor had appeared as yet in a perfect form in even a single man. Everything that contains an immortal germ of pure eternal truth seeks by transcending itself to reach a higher perfection. This it will do either if it is oppressed from without, and thrown into a sphere too confined for it, which it must at last burst through so as to get free externally, in order that it may not be in future always limited and oppressed from without; or if it does not as yet possess within itself in a collected form everything by which it can continue its work for all time, and longs to have its inherent defects supplied. Thus the Theocracy in Israel possessed always the firm, ineradicable consciousness of its own lasting duration and divine indestructibility, not less at the commencement in the enthusiastic anticipation and hope of the true prophetism and amidst the hosannas of its own foundation, than at the full midday of its brightest splendour and its greatest power with reference to surrounding nations; and still, behind the thick veil of the Hagiocracy, it looks forth with this eternally youthful confidence into the wide world, if with a dimmed eye, yet with a swelling heart. But every prophetic anticipation that Jahveh would some day bring into immediate subjection to Himself the entire human race in the same manner as Israel had been till then subject, and every longing desire, even in the earliest times, for a rule of Israel over the heathen, was a form of that endeavour after the consummation of the Divine work which had been commenced, and a feeling, in a clearer or vaguer form, that even the existence of the Theocracy on earth could be secured only by its further extension. And every complaint of the defectiveness of the past development of the life, or even of the institutions and laws, of Israel (and such complaints were raised with greater definiteness, frequency, and urgency in the course of the centuries), was a much more conscious endeavour after the same consummation; every prophetic anticipation of a new and nobler reshaping of Israel, and of the correct means for accomplishing this, was like a powerfully rousing effort beforehand of the mind and the imagination to attain it.

In this sense the endeavour to attain the Consummation pervades the whole past history of Israel from the time of Moses, always growing and becoming more urgent with every great advance of the history, the more the Theocracy is oppressed from without, and the more it feels in its own life the defects which still cleave to it, and without the thorough removal of which by new energies and truths it must at last perish. This

endeavour after the Consummation, or at least a feeling of its necessity, pervades gradually more or less clearly the entire nation in all its more living members. But it necessarily made itself felt soonest and most clearly in the spirit of those who had founded this entire Theocracy,[1] and who then protected it most unweariedly and steadfastly in all its stormiest times, and lent the brightest light to it in its darkest moments, as far as men had power to do all this. We refer to the prophets.

Neither, indeed, in the course of these 1,500 years had there been wanting actual attempts to make good pressing defects, if they threatened too imminently the existence of the Theocracy. Attempts were likewise made to restore the fundamental constitution of the Theocracy to its first pure form in all those respects in which it had suffered corruption. And everywhere, where anything truly beneficial was to be accomplished by such attempts, it was pre-eminently the prophets who were the original promoters and inciters. The entire second phase of this history, with its irresistible force and its elevated enthusiasm and prosperity at first, had been brought about by the profoundest practical effort of the prophetic spirit, with the view of establishing in the Community a possession which it still lacked, which had, indeed, been at first rejected by it. And just before the expiration of this phase, which was the richest of all in great energy and great deeds, the attempt of the Deuteronomist[2] to lead back the combined Theocracy and Basileocracy, enriched with the knowledge and requirements of the new age, to its first pure foundations, was carried through as far as this was well possible in those times of decline. But all such reforms and new constructions had not removed the deepest defects which adhered to the kingdom of God as it had been historically developed in Israel. So that the last great prophets themselves, beholding in spirit the perishableness and the certain destruction of the whole past development, described, indeed, very definitely the more particular form of the necessary Consummation, but expected its realisation only from a somewhat distant future, and from forces which had hitherto not been at hand.[3] The last form of the kingdom of God—the Hagiocracy, which more and more hid and disfigured that kingdom itself—however, had become so necessary and so powerful in the third great phase of the whole past history, simply because the Consummation continued still to defer its coming. Neither was this last form instituted purely by prophets, or protected by them, but it

[1] Acc. to vol. ii. pp. 47 sq. [2] See vol. iv. pp. 221 sq. [3] See vol. iv. pp. 291 sq.

arose only as an expedient of the time and was perpetuated as such. Happily during the 600 years of the existence of the Hagiocracy the longing for the coming of the Consummation at last could not die out or be suppressed.

This coming of the Consummation still continued to delay, even after so many centuries of the last phase of the destinies of the nation. Indeed, it had then so long delayed that many might wholly despair of it, or form very erroneous ideas of it.

It is true that the main outlines of the hopes of this Consummation had been too plainly and too forcibly sketched in the earlier books, which were now deemed sacred, to permit them to remain generally unknown. At least, those members of the nation who occupied themselves more earnestly with the sacred books, could not remain in ignorance of the general bearing of these outlines, or neglect to gather from them some kind of hope for the future of the people. But it lies in the nature of every hope, which is widespread, and, like this, very ancient, that it can be regarded by individuals in very different ways. By some it will be more coldly, by others more passionately, conceived, by some more vaguely, by others more distinctly, while it will be made to refer to various objects. Indeed, the longer its fulfilment is deferred, the more easily can it be wholly rejected by less serious minds, and so attenuated and explained away by others, who deem themselves discerning people, that scarcely any true and still less any salutary virtue remains in it. How small its significance is in the case of Josephus, for instance, is shown by the entire tone and bearing of his historical works; and if his indifference, or his caution, in this respect may be somewhat excused by the peculiar circumstances of his life (a point to be examined further on), the writings of Philo prove how vague and how uninfluential it was in the case of this philosophic rhetorician. Moreover, such hopes grow uncommonly high at certain favourable moments, and easily lay hold of all minds that are at all susceptible, even besides the prophets, as we have seen in several places of this history. But in ordinary quiet times they fall all the lower, and retain scarcely, in the spirits of a few, that fire by which they impel to nobler effort. The Hagiocracy must be most unfavourable to them, whenever this form of government has been more solidly developed and the hopes themselves on the other hand grow more lively and invite to corresponding action. For the Hagiocracy looks with onesided exclusiveness into the past, in order to maintain as the highest things in life what had once been deemed sacred, either truly or from prejudice, and it

seeks to bind the world to that. In this punctilious retrospective reference to antiquity, and this erroneous attempt to rule the present by it, the Hagiocracy loses more and more the quick and unprejudiced eye for the true necessities of the present and the future. Indeed, in the end it may get so far astray that when it must after all think seriously of the eternal unfolding of the future, it then adopts the most destructive view of the coming Consummation, and grossly misconceives the truest one.

Now this was exactly the condition of the most recent period with regard to the most hidden and deepest foundation of the life of a Community of the true God. The Hagiocracy had already developed itself thus completely, and thus certainly had it arrived at an extreme point, where, voluntarily or involuntarily, it must be urged on to some Consummation transcending itself or perish. For it was not difficult to perceive that the Hagiocracy, in the fully developed form in which it had long existed, had really not established the prosperity which it had promised, and was not bringing that Consummation which was the deep desire of the times. If in spite of this, therefore, it was still regarded as true, and nothing better transcending it could be anticipated and grasped, the supposition must have been that it had failed only because it had not yet been perfectly enough carried out, and that in the realisation of its extreme consequences lay the longed-for Consummation of everything in Israel. In the hallowed observance of the Holy Law there must be a return to the beginning of the Theocracy itself; the Hagiocracy must become in the true sense the Theocracy itself, by Israel's casting off the yoke of all the heathen, as was done in the time of Moses. In that case the favour of God would be with Israel again, and all blessings can be granted to it; even the heathen will at last all be subject to it; so that the Consummation promised by the prophets will be possible. Yea, to offer life joyfully for this hope is itself the commencement of its realisation. This is, as we have seen,[1] the doctrine and the practice of the Gaulonite, and the thorough-going, logical consequence of the Hagiocracy, which must, when once it has been clearly perceived, become the real, that is, the spiritual, power of the time, in spite of all checks and persecutions.

Was this then to be that Consummation for which the purest and profoundest spirits in the Community of the true God had for so many centuries sighed, for which they had also

[1] *Ante*, p. 48.

wrestled, not knowing how and when it would definitely come, with all the energies of their natures, and the thought of which alone had caused their hearts to beat with joyful emotion? Undoubtedly the end of the whole of this long history of Israel now tended to recur irresistibly to its commencement, inasmuch as all the possibilities which were involved in its course of development had at length been completely exhausted with the legal zealotism of the Gaulonite. The deepest moving principle of life in this Community, after it had gone through all the violent and the gentler movements and agitations which arose out of its first historical origin and continuation, now resorted, on its final exhaustion, to the primal spring of this life itself, to ascertain whether it might still find there hidden, unexhausted and inexhaustible energies, by which it could through a perfect Consummation of the ancient religion attain a new and better one. But was this to be the conclusion of the old form of the national and religious history and the commencement of a new one, that simply the external form should be restored in which the Community of the true God had first entered the world, as this form is found described in the Sacred Books? In that case, how would the actual defects which adhered to the national and religious development have been made good? The long course of the history had now brought them to light, and it was through them alone that the free and salutary advances of this history had been increasingly obstructed and everything had been brought back to the present extremities. Can old conditions ever be externally made to take a really new and nobler form merely by man's repetition of them, without the actual removal of their faults and the supply of the powers which they lack?

Thus the whole history now tended necessarily, it is true, to go back to its very first and purest commencement; and it was a last advantage that now in the doctrine and life of the Gaulonite the final and most dangerous error which could arise in connection with this extremely multiform and protracted movement was fully brought to light. This error could only now for the first time proceed to put forth its greatest energies, and it had to be overcome with its deceptive consummation before the true Consummation could come. It was only by new powers, capable of completely removing everything imperfect, erroneous, and injurious which the history had now by all its phases brought out, that that Consummation and that end could come which would alone correspond to the great matter and its beginning; and the coming of these new powers was precisely the first

condition of the Consummation. On two suppositions, indeed, the old Community would now have to be completely destroyed, even as regards its deepest life and spirit, and the final issue of the history of Israel, as closing in absolute darkness, would have to form simply the irrefragable proof that the immovable basis even of true religion had never been laid in Israel. Indeed, on these suppositions every attempt, within the limits and the sacred association of the Community as it had hitherto existed, to establish the desired nobler state of things would have been from the very first utterly vain. The two suppositions are, first, that the defects which had been brought to light by this long history were so inseparably bound up with the very earliest and purest life of the ancient Community that they had not been subsequently introduced into it by the limitations and necessities, or even by the wide extent and the disconnected character of the times; or, secondly, that the new powers which were required in this case could not find anything answering to them in the inmost spirit of the ancient Community to which they could appeal, or, indeed, make it possible that they should be both longed for and joyfully received by the ancient Community as a necessary supplement of its defects. Happily, these suppositions are not based on fact, and the first condition might be fulfilled. But if with its fulfilment the true Consummation at last came in due time and at the proper place, it would be possible that the ancient Community and the ancient religion in their old form should disappear from the earth without the destruction of what was immortal in them. It might turn out the fact that the majority of the members of the Community should refuse to acknowledge the Consummation, and that the great defects and faults which clave to the historical form of the ancient religion could not be again separated from it. In that case, it is quite true, that the final historical catastrophe would be inevitable, but it would not necessarily affect the immortal elements of the religion and the Community. Indeed, when these had at last come to their Consummation, they could then rise from the ashes of mortality in greater purity and with more victorious power. The possibility of all this was now at hand, if only the first condition, which was also the most difficult, should be fulfilled, this condition being now presented in the immediate future.

The Second Condition: the Highest Development of the Messianic Hope.

On the one hand, therefore, the Consummation, if it should now arrive, could, as regards its internal aspect, only come by means of completely new powers, which just because they constituted the desired perfection would also remove the defects of the unchangeably true ancient religion by means of a corresponding number of new powers and truths. But, on the other hand, with no less certainty it could, as regards its external appearance and form, only come by the fulfilment of those prophetic anticipations which had been formed regarding it with increasing definiteness during a long series of centuries. For this also is a clear proof of the complete soundness and vigour of the living principle of the germ of perfection, which was as yet only hidden within the ancient religion, and is strong testimony in its favour, that this germ could not even begin to stir in thought, as its first most secret and confined birthplace, without at once giving to itself a certain definite shape, fully corresponding to its life, a shape in which it might further exercise itself and grow stronger before it came into the light of day by forcing its way through the solid ground which divided it from reality, and a shape which then always continued to grow with the germ until the latter had become strong enough to burst through that solid ground. The genuine prophets did not simply anticipate the coming of the perfect state of things in general, they did not simply point out with growing clearness and definiteness the defects of the old state of things which the coming perfection had to remove; they also prophetically anticipated with equal precision the *manner* in which the perfection must come, and indicated with increasing particularity the form in which it could alone properly appear. Indeed, these two things are so closely connected that those prophets who with strongest faith held fast to the general certainty of the coming of the perfect Consummation, and whose minds struggled most agonisingly for this faith, were precisely those who also conceived with most originality, and described with most truth, the manner in which it must come.

As early a prophet as *Joel* had described both the Consummation and the manner of its realisation. Though he is not the oldest prophet known to us who first proclaimed the hope of Israel, he is the first who embraced it with such a glowing zeal and gave it shape in eloquent words. He had described

the Consummation as depending upon a new genuine Divine inspiration, which had never yet existed in such strength and depth of feeling, and before the sublime power of which all existing distinctions in social life would vanish, so that even the slaves would share in it and be by it transformed. This is an inspiration which could not then be more distinctly conceived than in the thought, that it must then permanently take possession of all in the same way as hitherto it had merely exceptionally and temporarily come upon the prophets.[1] But Joel had also demanded from men, as the first stage of preparation for this, an immediate, profound, and thorough repentance and a return to God *with the whole heart*; and had, therefore, at the same time prophetically foreseen that only those whom God may call (that is, not those, for instance, who may consider themselves worthy, but those who can be deemed worthy according to the Divine estimate) will share in the salvation of the Consummation.[2] With this the first and most necessary outward condition, which had to be made before any fulfilment of the blessed hope could be looked for, was defined. It was the return to the bases, the truths, and the energies of all true religion, together with the strict avoidance of all false ways which led away from them, and this with full decision and sincerity. But this is a duty which is obligatory upon all alike, and a demand which is in the end made upon all.

But, however, indispensable this profound repentance, as the first step towards the attainment of the Consummation, was then necessarily conceived to be, it must also have early become no less clear to the enlightened prophetic spirit that an extraordinary power was required to actually bring about this Consummation as a practical possession of the Community, and to transform Israel with its declining life into a new nation with an unending life. As now this hope of a complete renewal and reform could not exert much influence before that time of the division of the full stream of Israel's entire history, when even the strongest means of maintaining itself in its earthly form—the human monarchy—appeared to the people to be uncertain and not to have brought sufficiently the salvation expected from it, the prophetic anticipation accordingly early associated the coming of a second David closely with the coming

[1] Joel iii. 1, 2 (ii. 28, 29), and as regards its duration Mic. iv. 1–4, Is. ii. 2–4. Similar ideas, later, Is. xxxii. 15 sq.

[2] Joel ii. 12, 13; iii. 5 *ad fin.* (ii. 32). For although the call to repentance is occasioned in the first instance by the circumstances of that time, ii. 15, 16, it is certainly according to Joel's thought a first, necessary commencement of the possibility of the final Consummation which comes by different stages.

of the Consummation.[1] For at that time it was still quite well remembered how great good a true king like David could produce even in the Theocracy, and for the Theocracy, with a most energetic hand; and the consciousness was very decided that in Judah only the connecting bond and further development of all the spiritual treasures of Israel had remained unbroken. So that the hope of the time appeared capable of realisation by nothing else so much as by the return of a David. But when the prophetic anticipation and longing thus sought and demanded a second David as the founder of the perfected kingdom of God, the confession, though involuntary, was made of an infinite difficulty, the surmounting of which required the return of no weaker one than such a mighty hero. Yet the truest thought which was possible in this case was thus seized in the intense struggle of faith. For if a Consummation, which has been foreseen and believingly longed for, but has not yet appeared in the actual world, is to come, there must in the first instance be one individual in whom it actually appears, just as in human affairs of less importance where something new has to be originated, it is always one person who leads the way. In religion this one individual, supposing the true religion is for the first time in him brought to perfection in its purest height and celestial clearness, so that its image and its motive-power shine forth from him most forcibly, becomes *ipso facto* the true King of the kingdom of perfection, the leader of all other men to it, and the immortal head of the body of its Community. That David whose return was hoped for could be this kind of king only. For from the nature of the case, and from the fact that in the Community of Jahveh the most important thing was the attainment of the right religion, which would then be followed by the other blessings of life, including national prosperity and power as regards foreign nations, it was understood that a David, then appearing under so much more difficult conditions, must be himself a wholly different man from the first David, and a far more powerful one than he. And accordingly it was then the majestic and regal mind of Isaiah which in the more particular delineation of the character of this King of the perfected kingdom of God,

[1] The fact that Joel, in the passages of his writings which remain to us, speaks only of the perfected kingdom, not of a Consummator (except God), is historically of little significance, inasmuch as the hope in David's house generally had undoubtedly been already established in the tenth century, according to 1 Kings xi. 39, Amos ix. 11, Hos. i. 7, iii. 5 (in which passages it is only incidentally briefly referred to as something which had long existed). At the same time, the hope as thus expressed undoubtedly lacked the development which Isaiah gave to it immediately afterwards. Further comp. vol. iv. 59 sq.

this new, unique branch from the weather-worn stem of Jesse, presented to the world the most luminous model of the perfected life of true religion, and cast the brightest light into all the darkness of the future.[1]

But after Isaiah, with the force and fire of his believing soul, had pourtrayed with original power the exalted form which this eternal King would have to assume, it was impossible that either this prime model of all perfection should be again obscured, or that the hope of the certain coming of this King generally should ever be again surrendered. Not that this form of the hope could not be subsequently exposed to occasional temporary fluctuations. As the coming of this King was so long delayed, the *Deuteronomist* could propose simply to reform as thoroughly as possible the existing monarchy of Israel, and in connection with this, expect rather the longed-for profound reformation of the whole kingdom from a second Moses.[2] Amongst the prophets the Great *Anonymous* could in quite peculiar circumstances similarly hope for and demand a consummation possibly even without a Messiah belonging to Israel.[3] But such transient fluctuations were no longer able to destroy for long and generally the necessity of a conception and hope which had sprung from a very necessary truth. Subsequently great prophets only briefly referred to the hope, probably because Isaiah had already described it in such distinct and powerful lines; but they never wholly omitted it again from the number of the general hopes of the community.[4] For this hope of the coming of the perfect King who should bring the perfect kingdom was already closely connected with the kindred hope of the unending duration of a government of the Davidic house; and Israel had learnt to collect all its hopes of the

[1] See vol. iv. pp. 201 sq. The additions, in continuation of the prophecy, made by the anonymous prophet, 'Zechariah,' ix. 9, 10, and by Micah, ch. iv., v., affect only individual features of the original picture presented by Isaiah, and in other respects do not equal the sublimity, the luminous distinctness, and the wealth of the sketches of Isaiah.

[2] This expectation lies undoubtedly, according to the connection of all the thoughts of the Deuteronomist, also in the passage Deut. xviii. 15–19, discussed in vol. iv. p. 226, and an explanation is thus given of the possibility of the later expectation of the return of an Elijah, Mal. iii. The longer the coming of the Messiah was deferred and the more the difficulty of his coming was felt, the more were men led to expect the previous return of a great prophet as his precursor, whether this precursor was conceived of as Samuel, or Elijah, or Moses, see on this point below. With regard to the only apparently obscure passage Deut. xviii. 15–19, comp. further *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1861, pp. 1414 sq.; 1862, p. 1195.

[3] See vol. v. p. 45.

[4] Thus Jeremiah, xxiii. 5, 6; xxxiii. 14–16, and Ezekiel; and if the latter revives (xxxiv. 23, 24) the simple name of David, he thereby goes back to Hosea even. On the other hand, the oracle 'Isaiah,' lv. 4, 5, does not belong here, inasmuch as it promises only in general a return of Davidic times for all Israel, but does not speak of a Messiah.

indestructibility of even its higher spiritual treasures around the royal dignity of this ancient and sacred house which so tenaciously refused to perish.[1]

Nevertheless, the whole Davidic kingdom, with all the national power of Israel, had meanwhile fallen to the ground, and during the centuries of the New Temple and of the Hagiocracy, it could not be restored. Indeed, in spite of the Hagiocracy, all those holy things the sacredness of which went furthest back, as they were now described in the Sacred Scriptures, seemed, with the direct and powerful Theocracy itself, to have strangely disappeared from the earth, and to have been removed into a mysterious distance. This fact, therefore, became necessarily the greatest trial of the Messianic hope, which not only withdrew further and further off, notwithstanding the nearness and certainty of the fulfilment which most of the prophets had so enthusiastically proclaimed, but also seemed with the growing hopelessness, and, indeed, the complete eclipse of the Davidic house wholly to have lost its safe anchor. And thus the blessed hope and the bright consolation of Israel during the slow course of this last great phase of its history must have entirely perished, if they had not contained within them an imperishable foundation and an immortal truth. In reality the hope of a Messiah in the stricter sense often grew very faint during these centuries; and in the mere wisdom of this time the more general hope of Israel even had often no longer practically any place, as the Book of Ecclesiastes shows. Nevertheless, at no time more than now was it proved how indestructible the Messianic hope within the limits of this community was. Nor was it ever more clearly shown that though left without any support in the bright light of day and the wide world of the present, it was vigorous enough, notwithstanding, to seek and find the firmest supports in more distant and less accessible places. Even the common popular belief that the great ancient sacred things, which had now disappeared from sight, were only hidden in deep places of the earth to be brought to light again at the proper time,[2] was an involuntary expression of the indestructibility of the eternal hope. But the Messianic hope now took the most suitable and gloriously transfigured form, inasmuch as all the high treasures, symbols, and instruments of the true Theocracy were supposed to be removed into heaven, and to be securely hidden there until the proper time for their descent and re-appearance upon the earth.

[1] See vol. iv. pp. 294 sq.

[2] On this point in particular and its general bearing, see vol. v. 171 sq.; comp. also *ante*, p. 69.

This *celestialising*,[1] so to speak, of the Messianic hopes now advanced from natural beginnings, which had long been made, continually further. For even the older prophets had already in spirit beheld all the perfected objects with as great a conviction of their certainty, and described them with as much distinctness, as if they were present, although hidden from the eye of sense. Ezekiel had in spirit described even the temple, the holy city, and the holy land, with as much vivid detail as if they had actually existed in secret. And, in the midst of the rise of the second temple and Jerusalem, Zechariah had had a vision of a temple and a holy city much larger and more majestic than those which were then actually restored.[2] If nevertheless all sacred things on the earth continued to fall far short of these prophetic models and promises, and if all the high treasures of the Community of the true God seemed more and more plainly to have vanished from the earth, as if by some inexplicable charm, whilst all the time men continued to believe firmly in their actual existence, though that had not yet been made visible, they had necessarily to be conceived as at present preserved in heaven with God. Good and holy things, it is true, as far as they appear in a concrete form at any particular moment and are presented visibly to men, never correspond perfectly to the eternal and perfect goodness and holiness, as it has even once perhaps appeared in earlier moments of fleeting time, and in a more sensible, perfect and powerful shape; and the holy in its visible form always resembles the holy in its pure celestial form only as a copy resembles the original picture. Just as the 'Book of Origins' also had previously represented all the holy things of that time simply as borrowed from celestial models.[3] Still, never before the present time had such a wide chasm been felt to exist between the holy in its desired eternal, and its present temporal form; between the holy thing aspired after and the holy thing actually existing. So that the necessity to conceive the perfectly holy as at all events existing safely and inviolably in heaven, and as some time to descend thence upon the earth, now first became great and imperative. And the celestialising of the Messianic hopes gradually included every particular which had significance in this connection. Not only were the Ark of the Covenant and similar holy things from ancient times which had now been altogether lost,[4] regarded as preserved in heaven, but men became accustomed also to look

[1] The author coins the word *verhimmlichung*.—Tr.

[2] Zech. ii. 5–9, 15, [ii. 1–5, 11,] iii. 9, iv. 10, viii. 20–23.

[3] See vol. i. p. 87.

[4] See vol. v. 171 sq.

upon the true temple and the true holy city as celestial treasures and to long for them as some day to descend from heaven to earth.[1] Accordingly the Messiah also, with all his glory and his kingdom, could now be hoped for as already eternally existing in heaven. And all the hopes of the Consummation, when it seemed as if they must fade, were now, on the contrary, revived and strengthened in the most marvellous manner; inasmuch as, in conformity with their own immortal nature, they had now at last found their refuge where they must be absolutely safe and the inalienable possession of all who believed in them.

It must be allowed that the men of this late age, in their transition period between the exalted past of Israel and the still more exalted future of Israel's hope, lived generally as under a veil which grew continually denser, which caused them to look forth with all the greater desire into the distant cloudless heaven. With exaggeration and unreasoning love of mystery, they transferred everything salutary and sublime which they aspired after into heaven. In the case of the sacred Scriptures also, inasmuch as they in certain main sections really grew increasingly obscure, a celestial sense was imagined, which seemed to open itself to few or none then living, and without which the sacred Scriptures, it was felt, could not be profitably read and salutarily applied to the present.[2] And true it is that the perfect things, which these later generations expected, must be celestial, that is, infinitely more exalted than any former things, otherwise they would not have been worthy of such a hope; but in proportion as they were contemplated and hoped for by these generations in their sublime elevation, the more were they then required to become realised fact, if they were truly to satisfy the hope. Now, in the case of no other object of the nation's faith and hope had the glorifying transfiguration, for which we have used the term celestialising, been so properly conditioned by the logical development of this whole history, and therefore been made so necessary or salutary, as in the case of the Messianic hopes in the stricter sense, that is, those which centred in the Messiah and his reign. For the Davidic kingdom, even in its last fragments, had long ago passed away; indeed, it seemed nowhere to offer even the rallying point of a new rising. The Davidic family itself, although perpetuated in

[1] Gal. iv. 26, Heb. xi. 10, 16, xii. 22, xiii. 14, Rev. xxi. 1 sq. It was only like a first beginning and suggestion of this belief, that such pictures of the temple and Jerusalem as Ezekiel and Zechariah had sketched were compared with the reality, and were translated into heaven, inasmuch as they did not answer to the latter.

[2] This is the allegorical interpretation, vol. v. pp. 257 sq.

obscurity, had so completely fallen into decay since Zerubbabel's death,[1] that, even as far back as the Maccabean rising, it was no longer thought of. The nation had under all the various heathen governments become more and more subservient and increasingly divided and broken up. And dissimilar as its heathen rulers were, heathenism, as such, had now for centuries appeared nevertheless to be the sole great earthly power, and to form one sole all-embracing empire. Indeed, the longer the redemption of Israel and the erection of a perfected kingdom of God was delayed, the more difficult was this felt to have become from the above and other causes. There prevails, therefore, at this time involuntarily the feeling, that the coming of the Messiah and of his kingdom must be still more wonderful, that is, must be accompanied by still higher unforeseen Divine powers and works, than had been ever before expected.

It is true the older prophets had previously been unable to conceive the entrance of the perfected kingdom into the world as possible save in connection with corresponding miraculous signs, occurrences, and actions,[2] and Isaiah, in his strong effort to sketch the picture of the longed-for perfect King, had been able to describe only a life of such a kind that in it the purest Divine Spirit should pervade everything, accomplish everything, and glorify everything, so that whatever was human in this King should be transfigured into the Divine itself; and his action, his word, his breath, be as that of God Himself.[3] This portrait of the Messianic King was the highest model of a perfected human life which anyone in the ancient Community could, down to that time, conceive and pourtray for the future. But now the idea of the Messiah is more and more separated from all that is limited and frail by too close contact with the earth; it is, as far as is at all possible, transfigured more and more absolutely into the Divine glory, omnipotence, and eternity; because men truly felt, with greater or less clearness, that a vast supply of highest authority must dwell in the Messiah, if he was to bring the Kingdom of God in the face of all the accumulated obstructions. If he is already hidden in the invisibility of heaven, that he may at the right moment establish the kingdom of heaven here below, he may have been there from of old, from of old have invisibly founded and conducted his kingdom which had not yet appeared below; and when he at last visibly appears, he is the absolutely powerful one, victorious against the whole

[1] Vol. v. pp. 117 sq.

[2] Comp. my notes on Joel iii. 3 sq. (*Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 136 sq.), and Isaiah, ch. vii. sq. (*ibid.* vol. ii. pp. 81 sq).

[3] See *ibid.* pp. 84 sq., 106 sq., 237 sq.

rebellious earth, with all its kings and princes, so that the vast power of heathenism is precipitated before him in a moment, as a high but unstable colossus collapses when struck by one mighty stone.[1] Under the influence of this idea of the celestial Messiah, who was, therefore, like everything perfectly Divine, existing from eternity, the idea of the son of David, as well as everything of a more temporal and terrestrial nature, could easily lose its significance. The prophets of the first times of the new Jerusalem might again designate him, after the example of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the *offshoot* (of David), or by similar names;[2] and subsequently this special hope in David's family could not easily vanish entirely,[3] because it was the strongest support of the equally true idea of a progressive development and final fulfilment of all the national hopes. But neither in the Book of Daniel, nor (which is still more significant) in the more elaborate and very various descriptions of the Book of Enoch, is any weight attached to such an extraction and terrestrial localisation of the Messiah, inasmuch as he is regarded everywhere in these books as an absolutely celestial being. In the Book of the Assumption of Moses, too, which is most immediately occupied with these times,[4] so little does the Messiah appear as David's son that he is, on the contrary, called simply *the messenger* (of God) *who is stationed highest*, as if he were with this priestly name only placed above Moses,[5] which is logically consistent in these times of the highest development of the Hagiocracy.

For it is impossible not to see that this highest development of the idea of the Messiah to be expected took place exactly in the middle of the last phase of this history, preceding the Maccabean victory, at a time of peculiar elevation, and yet just when not only all the national hopes but the eternal hopes of Israel were once more profoundly shaken, and the return of a Davidic king appeared wholly impossible. It was in such a time as this that the eternal hope recovered itself with all the

[1] Dan. ii. 34, 35.

[2] Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12. The abbreviated name *Offshoot* for the greatest scion, or young man, who is expected, does not originate probably simply in the artistic language of the times, but also in a deliberate avoidance at that time of the name '*David's* offshoot,' inasmuch as the name David does not once occur, remarkably enough, in Haggai and Zechariah. This fact is explained from vol. v. pp. 110 sq.

[3] 'Psalms of Sol.,' xvii. 23 sq., xviii. 6 sq. (comp. vol. v. p. 301), and in the New Testament.

[4] See *ante*, p. 55 sq.

[5] See vol. v. pp. 174. The passage in the *Assumptio* referred to is ch. x.: *tunc implebuntur manus* (which is also a priestly allusion after the phrase מָלֵא יָד) used of the priest's authority *nuntii qui est in summo constitutus, qui protinus vindicabit eos ab inimicis eorum*; the *nuntius* is מַלְאָךְ after the later application of the word, as Moses himself is designated, ch. xi., *magnus nuntius*.

greater intensity and permanence by this new radiant picture of celestial certainty. The Messiah came forth most clearly before the prophetic eye as from eternity safely waiting in those heights where all the eternal possessions of Israel were conceived to be beaming in indestructible glory, that they might again descend at the right time into the visible world. And we are quite entitled to suppose, from the sources now open to us, that it was no other than the author of the Book of Daniel, with his strong enthusiasm and profound originality, who first committed to writing, in a few clearly drawn lines of brief winged discourse, this entire view of the celestial Messiah and the Kingdom of Heaven.[1] Shortly afterwards the first author of the Book of Enoch, as it has come down to us, carried out further the main outlines which had been given in the Book of Daniel, with the same glowing warmth of language, indeed, with an intensity of deep desire which could not be more profoundly sincere, and at the same time with much greater repose and elaboration than is met with in the earlier book.[2] It is the new idea of a *universal judgment*, to be delegated by God to the Messiah, which now becomes of the highest importance. It is a universal judgment upon the whole earth, which has long been determined upon by God, before which all heathen kings and lords at once sink into the dust; indeed, before which heathenism generally collapses quickly into its primitive nothingness, in order that from that time forth the 'people of the saints,' or of 'the chosen' may rule for ever under this consecrated King (Messiah), and thus the Theocracy be consummated on the earth. And the prophet beholds how, at the supreme moment when the judgment shall be held and the judgment books have already been opened, in the midst of the innumerable hosts of the winged angels which encircle the Divine throne, one appears of an entirely different nature, *like a son of man*, that is without wings, and who is yet conducted before this throne, being borne upon the clouds of heaven, in order that he may receive from the supreme Judge Himself the commission to execute the sentence passed, and, going instead of Him into the world, to judge the world. For much as the idea of the Messiah was now celestialised and glorified, it could

[1] Dan. vii. 10, 13, 14, 26, 27, ii. 34, 35, 44, 45, are the brief words of infinite meaning in this respect.

[2] All the three first authors of our Book of Enoch speak of the Messiah; which is very instructive, as showing that the Messianic hope was far from being dormant in those times, or rather as showing that there was then a new revival of it. However, it is well to observe, that it is only the first of the three who is really original in this respect. Comp. my *Abhandlung über des Buches Henókh Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammensetzung*. Gött. 1854.

not well so far degenerate from its original root that the Messiah could be ever regarded seriously as a mere spirit, or angel, even though it were the highest, because in that case he would have been transformed into his exact opposite. It was still impossible that even as regards his celestial significance and dignity he should be otherwise regarded than as essentially a man, or, in accordance with the higher form of language, as an individual 'son of man,' and therefore appearing to the prophetic vision 'as a son of man' in direct contrast to the winged angels, and thereby, in outward form too, easily enough distinguished from the angels. The series of ideas which had been formed regarding the Messiah was not completed until this had been reached. On the one hand, he was regarded as from all eternity already dwelling invisibly in heaven, and endowed with the purest celestial glory and power, the Chosen and the Holy One absolutely before God, who was ruling with God and receiving from Him the highest conceivable lot as his due; on the other, he was nevertheless not conceived of as a mere spirit and angel, but as a man and member of this nation, and as the glorifier both of this nation and of all mankind. Indeed, just because the celestial character belonging to him was now principally grasped, the idea of the 'son of man'[1] as by a proper counterpoise, once more received greater prominence. We see this plainly in the first author of the Book of Enoch, who now borrows from the Book of Daniel particularly the name 'son of man.' In one passage[2] he varies this name by using that of the 'son of woman' even. He uses these names for the first time as the simple prophetic designations of the Messiah, thereby manifestly presupposing the Book of Daniel as already well known generally at that time. But like the Book of Daniel, the Book of Enoch was also very soon much read by certain sections of the people; indeed, it may almost be said, that it was received and appropriated with eager desire and rejoicing, as may be gathered with certainty from its early translation into the Greek, from the New Testament,[3] and even from the history of

[1] When, Dan. x. 16-18, a higher angel 'like a man' appears to Daniel and touches him accordingly, care must be taken not to regard this representation as identical with the wholly different one, vii. 13. An angel, when necessary, can appear as a mere man; and in this case he must thus appear from a special cause, namely, not to alarm Daniel too much, but to talk with him quietly. Further, comp. *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.*, iii. pp. 231 sq.; for often as it has been maintained by certain authors of most recent date that the people of Israel may be understood by the 'son of man,' vii. 13, this remains, nevertheless, a wholly baseless and erroneous view.

[2] En. lxii. 5; we may, however, quite properly suppose also an allusion to Isa. vii. 14, Mic. v. 2 [v. 3], comp. with Gen. iii. 15.

[3] As I observed as early as 1827 in connection with the Book of Revelation, and as can now be more distinctly proved. For instance, if only the phrases En.

the origin of the present composite book.[1] By this means also the sublimer idea of the Messiah grew more and more prevalent.

But if from such causes, which lay in the whole development of the highest endeavour of Israel, the hope of the Messiah had been spiritualised to the highest degree possible, and had been absolutely taken up into celestial exaltation and eternity, having been removed as far as possible from everything terrestrial, it is not any more surprising that it also sought for new ideas and words which should best answer to it in this its purest sublimation. The firm hope in the Messiah, the longing, struggling, thought of him, seeking consolation and rest, had at last become the ultimate anchor of all the most pious feelings and holiest endeavours of Israel. *He* had at last become to the heart longing after the Consummation the sum and substance of all its devoutest hopes; with *him* it was expected that all the sublimest possessions which silent but intense enthusiasm longed for must come, and with him they seemed to already exist hidden in heaven, in order that they might at the right time be communicated through him to the elect who waited for him. If, therefore, *he* could not in thought be raised sufficiently high, the religious imagination, which was exclusively bent with utmost fervour upon his mysteriously hidden, and at the same time divinely necessary, nature, wrestled with all the highest ideas presented to it in the hope of finally discovering that one which would best meet its demands.

Such an adequate name was that of *son of God*. With it the reigning king of Israel could formerly be distinguished before all other members of the Community of God. At all events the name could be used of him in elevated language and on solemn occasions. It was used not to flatter the monarch, but in accordance with the strict idea of the true religion—that if all members of this Community are children of God,[2] elevated

xcvi. 4, 6, xcvii. 4, xcix. 3 are compared with the εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, Mar. i. 44, vi. 11, xiii. 9, 10 (further see my work *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. p. 241, yet the meaning is in all cases 'in order that they may be inexcusable if they believe not'); or the phrase 'as the mountain never became a servant, and the hill will never become a woman's maid' (i.e. as the mountains cannot be used as servants, it is equally certain that sin was not *sent* to the earth), En. xcviii. 4 with Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21, it will be seen that the phrases of the Book of Enoch cannot have been borrowed from the Gospels, and that they are repeated from the Book of Enoch in the Gospels, although applied in another sense.

[1] On this point see the *Abhandlung* above referred to.

[2] Acc. Deut. xiv. 1, comp. Isa. i. 2, xxx. 1, 9, and again with a wider reference Ex. iv. 22, 23: the same thing is expressed in a stronger form, Wisdom of Sol. ii. 13, 18, xviii. 4, comp. ver. 13, xvi. 21, 26, xiv. 3; according to the *Assumption of Moses* also, ch. x., *Cœlestis*, i.e. God, will at the end of days shake the earth as judge *propter filios suos*.—Comp. also vol. v. p. 483, and further Philo, *Opera*, vol. ii. p. 18, ch. 23 and 24; pp. 29 sq., ch. 36; *Life of Moses*, i. 28, p. 106; iii. 14, p. 158; iii. 24, 35, 39, p. 164, 23, 175, 179; *De Monarch.* i. 2, and elsewhere fre-

to this dignity by divine grace and education, and at the same time called to remain always faithful to this higher stage of life, then the true king of the Community is destined above everyone else to attain such an exaltation, in order that he, as standing nearer to God than anyone else, may enjoy most fully His grace and protection, while at the same time, should he depart from God, he must feel his chastisement most directly and most severely.[1] Neither was this highest name, thus understood, too high, as long as it was derived from the deepest and purest source of the true religion, and was only applied in the truly proper place. And if it had a double edge, so that it could be turned against the actually reigning monarch with painful severity the moment he became unfaithful to his true calling, as a matter of course, when it was applied to the Messiah, it could only be in the noblest sense it could bear. This name, however, together with that of *co-regent*, or of one sitting at God's right hand,[2] could gradually come to be transferred to the Messiah with the greater ease the less men were accustomed in these late times to find in the actual Community of Israel such exalted kings as were described in Ps. ii. and cx., and the more they hoped, therefore, to meet with the true realisation of such ideals of kingship, as well as of all Biblical ideals, only in the Messiah himself.

But supposing that the desire existed of applying this conception of the son of God to the exalted celestial Messiah, how was it possible to work it out in detail? He could not be thought of as a man already born, as long as he was an object of simple hope, as one who must some time appear in the world, but was hitherto purely a celestial existence. The conception of celestial existences, however, had as early as the time of the Book of Job, gradually assumed freer forms, mainly under the influence of the spirit of the ancient religion of Israel, as I have shown on various other occasions.[3] If,

quently; although Philo connects the idea of God as Father more with His relation to the universe.

[1] See my comment on Ps. ii.; and as regards the double aspect of this elevation, comp. 2 Sam. vii. 14, and this repeated later, Ps. lxxxix. 31–33.

[2] The first passage in which we now meet with this name applied to the Messiah is Enoch cv. 2; but precisely because it is here used only at the end of a book as a name that was well known, it must have been previously explained somewhere else with all due definiteness and fulness. And certainly such prophetic passages as Isa. vii. 14, ix. 5, 6, could very properly be appealed to in order to connect them with this more exalted name.—In the *Fourth Book of Ezra* [2 Esdras], which in its ideas of the Messiah follows chiefly the Book of Enoch, he is, according to the original reading in xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9, probably called עַבְדִּי, ὁ παῖς μου, after 'Isa.' xlii. 1, as is seen from the Arabic translation; yet the ancient Latin and the Ethiopic versions have instead *my son*, or simply *son*. When the Ethiopic, xiii. 32, substitutes for the first time *man*, that is merely a misunderstanding of παῖς.

[3] See my *Commentary on the Book of*

therefore, it was already quite possible, without transgressing the bounds of the true religion, to distinguish between good and evil, higher and lower, celestial beings, there was no reason why the celestial Messiah should not be conceived of as the son of God after the manner of a first celestial spirit, who, as already always present in heaven, and standing nearest the throne of God, participated in all the highest Divine counsels, already felt the deepest sympathy with the lot of the righteous,[1] and would appear on the earth at the proper time, after God had delegated to him the universal judgment. Now, although every purely spiritual being must, in conformity with the spirit of the true religion, if it is not to be debased to heathenism, be thought of as existing from all eternity,[2] yet, in the case of the idea of the Messiah, as has been previously shown, the distinctive human element could at the same time never be wanting. Accordingly this son of God and highest celestial spirit is at the same time the primal, ideal Man, the eternal archetype of celestial humanity as it stands nearest to God in glory, purity, and love; and in so far the counterpart of the Adam as debased in the actual world of sin. All these conceptions were not far to seek; and if we now find in somewhat earlier books but occasional and remote traces of them,[3] they must still, as these very traces show, have been early developed.

And after all it is another idea which had to be adopted to complete this series of conceptions. The purely celestial Messiah, although he must be thought of as at the same time of a human nature, is, for the meditative and longing man, too much a mere conception, particularly inasmuch as he is *ipso facto* simply invisible, and has, indeed, not once even appeared in a bodily form in the world. He is in that form truly a conception of infinite influence, as we can equally well say, a spiritual power, an existence in heaven of great potency as regards

Job, pp. 78 sq. [Eng. Trans., pp. 62 sq.], 2nd ed. of the Germ.; this *History*, i. pp. 100 sq., iv. p. 199, v. 183 sq., 188 sq.

[1] As is specially remarked with great effect in the oldest portion of the Book of Enoch, e.g. xlviii. 4, 7.

[2] The eternity and pre-existence of the Messiah, that he was always with God from the beginning, is likewise strongly insisted upon in the Book of Enoch, e.g. xlviii. 3, 6, 7, lxii. 7. On the other hand, a conception of his pre-existence of this kind is in no way to be got from Mic. v. 1 [A. V. ver. 2], inasmuch as in this passage it is simply his Davidic origin which is spoken of.

[3] In the passages Job xv. 7, Prov. xxx. 4, Ezek. xxviii. 12, sq. The thing is correctly to understand such passages as regards their entire meaning, and with all that they in any way indicate as the ultimate basis of their figures and style If that is done, the above interpretation of them will not be doubted, just as I have in fact always understood them thus. It is true that in Prov. xxx. 4, it is, according to the artistic manner of that passage, only a godless scorner who speaks of God and His celestial son; but the point is, that he is able to speak of him in such a familiar and generally intelligible manner.

man. Still if this power is to attain its highest significance, it must ultimately have in God Himself and His nature its necessary basis, and an existence inseparable from Him. Now all such ideas as Messiah, Co-regent, and, indeed, Son of God, do not really conduct to that of a powerful being thus necessarily finding its basis in God and inseparable from Him. These ideas have too much a merely external existence without any necessary connection with the idea of God; as, in fact, they were not used at first of the Messiah, but only transferred from historical persons to him above all others, and then, it is true, probably used of him alone. But at that time the idea of the *Word of God*, or more briefly, *the Word*, had already become of far greater significance. For long before the great prophets, from Moses onwards through so many centuries, had made an established place for this Word in the world, indeed, had glorified it for all time; but since they had passed away, it was immortalised more and more in the world in an outward form also in the Sacred Scriptures, as the great imperishable, divine power, and as a visible representative of the Invisible Himself, as the bright light of the righteous, the strong weapon against the world and worldliness, the never-failing consolation of the despairing. Now, when this Word, which had thus become a great spiritual power, was further reflected upon, men necessarily found in the end that it was not confined to the living prophets or to the Scriptures. It was seen, according to Gen. i., as early as the Creation, to be the first thing that proceeded from God, and men learnt to consider it with regard to its significance for the whole world, inasmuch as no contradiction can exist between the Divine speech and thought and the Creation itself; but the latter is only like the execution and embodiment of the former. Conceived thus as the Revelation of God Himself, the bright and distinct Revelation of His mind and His mysterious inner nature, it was properly regarded as the most immediate Divine power, and as an eternal, mysterious, and yet intelligible existence, wholly inseparable from God's complete being. But it then coincided substantially in this respect with the idea of *Wisdom*, so that everything Divine which had previously been surmised and enthusiastically uttered by the profoundest minds of quite a different school (namely, that of the ancient genuinely Hebrew philosophers) concerning Wisdom as a purely Divine power,[1] could now be transferred to the *Word* with equal, and, indeed, precisely in Israel in many respects, with greater propriety.

[1] See my notes on Job xxviii. and on Prov. i.–ix.

It is possible to trace in the Old Testament with a good degree of clearness the steps by which *the Word* in this higher sense gradually occurs with more and more emphasis and constancy.[1] According to these traces in the Old Testament, it required, as might naturally be expected, centuries before this higher view of the Word was fully developed. But if subsequently men ventured further to put the idea of this being, which was thus inseparable from the idea of God, on a par with that of the Messiah, indeed, to call the Messiah Himself by this name, at last the most suitable, perfect, and suggestive idea of the celestial Messiah was thereby supplied. For according to it the Messiah is in God Himself necessary, with Him from the beginning before the world existed, always working with Him, and whatever he produces is the purest revelation of the hidden Divine nature itself. It is true that we do not now know to what mind in Israel we owe the first expression of the final completion of the idea of the celestial Messiah; but, inasmuch as in the second and third author of the Book of Enoch, the Messiah is already called the sacred Word of God, and also simply the Word,[2] we may safely suppose that this view was in existence before the second century before Christ. And it is obvious enough from all that has been said above, that the idea was thus developed, even in this its perfect form, purely from the conceptions and aims existing in Israel without any foreign influence.[3] This devout hope, as the ultimate essence and the purest fruit of all the noblest effort of the nation, agitated too strongly through many centuries the hearts of the people to permit it to rest before the most expressive conception and most perfect idea had been developed from it; but just as the series of ideas connected with this hope is finally closing, we find the hope itself revelling in such infinitely rich

[1] Probably the earliest passages of this kind are Prov. xiii. 13, xvi. 20, and the proverb which has been preserved in the LXX. only after xxiv. 22. Comp. the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* xi. p. 18 sq. Then Ps. lvi. 5, 11, where also דְּבַר יְהוָה already becomes the simple דָּבָר, taking the form of a proper name; it is in this passage the prophetic Word, just as 'Isa.' xl. 8, lv. 11, Ps. cxix. 58, 76, 89, Sir. xlviii. 3, 5. The creative active Word appears Gen. ch. i., Ps. xxxiii. 6, cvii. 20, cxlvii. 15; the Word which embraces and sustains the world, Sir. xliii. 26; that which rules and punishes in the world, Wisdom of Sol. xviii. 15. As regards Philo, see vol. vi [German]. I have previously maintained that where ὁ λόγος is used in this higher sense, we ought to say in German *der* instead of *das Wort*.

[2] See my *Abhandlung über des Aeth. Buches Henókh Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammensezung*, pp. 40, 55.

[3] As must be further shown, particularly with reference to Philo, at the proper place in the next volume. The great inferences which followed naturally from the idea of the pre-existence of the Messiah can also be better examined below.

symbolic pictures as occur in the Book of Daniel and still more in the Book of Enoch.

With this celestialisation of the Messianic hope it accordingly reached for the first time its highest possible development; and it is marvellous to see how, on the one hand, all the previous development of Israel necessarily tended to this purest celestial elevation, and how, on the other hand, this development had now first become truly capable of meeting the highest demands which these last ages, according to their deepest necessities, made upon a true Messiah. For if the perfect consummation of all true religion and of all the noblest toils and struggles of the past was now to come, it was necessary, as was above shown, that those defects should be removed which adhered to it from the time of its origin under Moses. These defects of the Mosaic age, however, had really been conditioned by the whole previous development of the human race from the first dawn of all history. Yet no true Consummation was possible unless it put an end to the power of all the sins and errors which had appeared in previous history. It was needful, therefore, that one man should appear who should be as pure, holy, and exalted as man could have been from the creation but had not been. Accordingly, the Messiah, though taking his place in the midst of human history, must nevertheless appear with such originality and independence of his surroundings, that from all the past, before and after Moses, not the least thing should necessarily hinder and obscure his perfection, and in comparison with him even an Abraham, a Noah, and an Enoch should not be regarded as higher. It was in the midst of struggles with ancient errors, and without overcoming them all, that the true religion had in former times gained its temporal existence for a whole community; now when it at last endeavoured to reach its own perfect Consummation and must necessarily perish if it failed to attain it, it was compelled to take up the battle with all former sins and errors; and in order that only one perfect man might first appear as conqueror over them all, the end of all the past period of human development already tended at that time to revert to its earliest commencement. Now such a necessity and such a demand, which were implied in the very idea of the Consummation, could be completely met only by the thought of the celestial Messiah. By his very nature he occupies a place above all historical men, even above Moses and Abraham, and may confirm everything Divine that the holiest men of antiquity had ever striven after, while as a teacher and worker he can complete everything that

was at any time left unfinished and defective, and against whose Divine authority no one but God himself can have any power. And, moreover, since Israel had at this time long fallen under the power of various heathen nations, and the sins, errors, and supremacy of the heathen oppressed it, while its lot had become most closely involved in theirs, the true Messiah, if he were to come then, must also be conceived on this account as contending against all these nations, as with purely Divine power from heaven, to the end that he might, in spite of all the most powerful empires of the world, indeed, of collected heathendom, found his kingdom and give the Consummation a home upon the earth.—Thus the celestialisation of the Messiah, in every view of it, was the highest, and at the same time the only adequate, development of the entire Messianic hope. This hope, as the highest spiritual blessing which Israel strove to attain in conformity with its long course of national development, it is true, had thus with all spiritual endeavour assumed very various forms in the course of many centuries, and, if all its temporal shapes were to be taken together at once, it comprehended not a little that could be harmonised only with difficulty. At the same time, through all ages to its very highest summit, it had been developed in the most direct line of progress, inasmuch as it above everything still belonged to the most living portions of the higher national life.

As the Messianic hope, as regards the means and powers essential to the Messiah, had been developed in the manner above described, and as the way in which he must appear, act, and live had been thus determined and correctly indicated beforehand in this Community, it follows of itself that he could be the true Messiah in reality only if he fulfilled also this second condition. He could come to this Community, if he was really the perfect one and the Consummator, as the one whose coming had long been certain by a Divine necessity and who should reveal himself from heaven, for whom the whole past history of the world and very particularly the sacred hopes of the Community of the true God looked; he could come as the true king who enters on his own authority into his inheritance in order to administer his kingdom.[1] And to this extent everything had been prepared for him; yet according to these very anticipations he could claim, in addition to the obedience which was his due as king, particularly as king from heaven, really simply the one proper means of amendment and perfection

[1] Such figures as Matt. xxi. 37, Luke xix. 13, are therefore perfectly appropriate, and have their origin in the very heart of the matter.

which everyone must adopt who will enter into perfection—namely, true repentance and return to the pure Divine life. The most effectual power to command and to work for the weal of a nation, or of any other society, that is available to men, and the benefits of which this nation had previously experienced to a memorable extent,—the royal power—came to his assistance as his rightful due; and the fact that, according to the highest development of the hope, this power must be that of a celestial king, not only necessarily added infinitely to its authority, but also tended to glorify and purify it from everything of an imperfect and hurtful earthly character. The fact that true repentance and conversion simply had been laid down beforehand as the primary claim which this royal power could make upon the servants of its kingdom, must from the very first be a warning against attempting anything wrong, and a reminder that to this Community that king alone might come and rule whom Israel had not found even in David, the king of the perfected true religion and its kingdom, the highest, the immortal and eternal king. He must come with the proper claim and its interpretation, must rule upon its basis, as the true king, healing cheerfully and confidently, as well as reigning irresistibly, and in all things from first to last revealing himself simply as the king expected from heaven with celestial perfection. This was involved in the anticipation, hope, and demand of all past times which had gone before him and called him forth as far as they were able, if he could come at all. And it was only when the fulfilment of this second condition perfectly coincided with the fulfilment of the first, that the highest result was possible and the entire hope as well as all the noblest struggles of the long ages need not prove fruitless. For the one possible way in which the Consummation could come in reality would then be complied with, so far as its course had already been prepared and levelled for the coming of him who was destined to tread it.[1]

The Third Condition: The Return to the Prophetic Spirit.

But the nature of these first two conditions, the fulfilment of which was incumbent on anyone who proposed to bring the

[1] The outlines of a trustworthy *Christology before Christ* have been supplied above as well as previously in the earlier volumes of this work. The idea of a *Messiah son of Joseph*, who should first appear and fall before Rome, in order then to make way for the true Messiah, is still quite foreign to the fourth book of Ezra [2 Esdras] as to which book, see vol. vii. pp. 69 sq. [German], and according to all appearances arose in the second century after Christ, probably at the beginning of the rising of Barcocheba. Comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1861, p. 1158.

Consummation, need only be considered a little more closely to show at once how great the difficulty was which stood in the way of even a proper preliminary attempt at their fulfilment. It is no small sign of the superior power and wisdom of this Community that it had in its midst given rise to such a magnificent hope which embraced the world, that it had thus clearly and confidently foreseen prophetically its own Consummation, and had thus correctly indicated beforehand the very way by which the Consummation had to arrive. No other religion was capable of so much. But what a distance lies between every hope and its fulfilment; and what an immense distance lies between them in this case, particularly after the Messianic hope, although with perfect logical consistency, had been carried to such a dizzy height that of existing human beings not one appeared to satisfy its requirements! Who should perform what was infinitely difficult, indeed, what appeared to be impossible? Nay, who should even correctly understand what had in this case to be understood and accomplished? Who should take that untried path which could alone conduct to the desired destination? What had never hitherto been beheld must in this case become manifest, what had never been attempted must be forthwith perfected. And yet in smaller matters everyone is apt to transfer to others what is more than usually difficult and dark. Already in the more vigorous prophetic times of declining antiquity, the realisation of these hopes had been in various ways vainly attempted, or at all events expected;[1] indeed, it had already at that time become a matter of ridicule in the case of many. How much more, after so many centuries, must this realisation now appear as scarcely possible to men in any conceivable way, since the hope itself had been more and more raised to heaven and thereby pushed back into an incalculably distant and exalted region! Although in many single souls the hope might glow, with greater or less brightness, upon the public affairs of the Community it had as little influence as upon the opinions and doctrines of the schools. The chief sects which had hitherto been formed in the nation were, as regards the basis of their existence, either quite indifferent to it, as was the case with the Pharisees and Sadducees, or were unable by their fundamental principles seriously to seek to follow it up. The latter was the case with the Essenes, who, by their very habit of retirement from the world, were compelled to leave unutilised a hope which was most expressly meant for the whole nation and State. The only other sect, that of

[1] See vol. iv. pp. 127 sq., 204 sq.

the Gaulonites, or Zealots, occupied by their origin a position hostile to its truest spirit. Indeed, it may be said with truth that no true heart for this hope was to be found amongst any of those who, like the Sadducees, favoured too free-thinking principles, or who, whether as officials or men of property, whether as masters, or saints, of the Law (Pharisees), or as zealots of the Law, were already absorbingly occupied with the interests of the present, nor amongst those who had in other ways lost all concern for the general Community; in fact, men of this kind might easily meet the hope with decided opposition, if it should show signs of energetic life.

According to the course which the national history had taken during these last five or six centuries, too, the hope in the coming of a Messiah must have appeared just at this time the most incapable of fulfilment when regarded from an earthly point of view. For this hope remains, it is true, from the end of the second great phase of the history of Israel the deepest and strongest support of the continuous course of this history itself,[1] to such an extent that, apart from it, the history, even in its greatest entanglements, cannot at all be understood; and however much at times it was checked, beclouded, weakened, it still never permitted itself, as regards its no less necessary than infinite meaning, to be dispensed with save by means of its true fulfilment. Now, this invincible hope had never hitherto, after the most various changes, been so greatly weakened in the eyes of the world as at this very moment. When, at the beginning of this last great phase of the history, Cyrus became the liberator of Israel, its brightness grew pale in comparison with this most brilliant star of the age, and it seemed as if it might itself quite vanish.[2] But it simply shone forth with the greater force and restlessness after his death amid the difficulties of the rise of the new Jerusalem, once more supporting itself outwardly upon the ancient house of David.[3] The early overthrow and final disappearance in the deepest darkness of that house,[4] however, produced under Ezra the period of the first calmer development of the ancient Law and of absorption in the glory of the simple past; and from that time everything Messianic exists only as having taken refuge in heaven, and was the more exclusively celestialised, as above described,[5] the further it seemed from all fulfilment in the actual present. Subsequently this purely celestial hope, perpetuated precariously for centuries, suddenly

[1] See vol. iv. pp. 287-295.
[2] See vol. v. p. 45.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 105.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 117 sq., and below in connection with Christ's birth.
[5] Pp. 69 sq.

rose in the time of the Maccabees, it is true, to its purest height, and immortalised itself in the most perfect conceptions and lasting symbols; but under the unfavourable times of the Asmoneans, and then particularly of the Herods, the hope of an early fulfilment by the immediate appearance of the celestial Messiah[1] melted away almost as suddenly. Accordingly, amid the increasing internal divisions and dissolution of the unity and strength of the nation, the endeavour of the present once more took refuge with all the greater zeal in reverent devotion to the glory of the past; and whilst the new study of the interpretation and application of the Law was being developed to greatest perfection, scrupulousness in observing all the precepts of the Sacred Law was the only thing which advanced to that last stage of development upon which it now stood. But the more exclusively the mind was now absorbed in antiquity and the scrupulous observation of its laws, and the more perfectly the Hagiocracy was developed as their guardian, the further was the attention diverted from the Messianic future and from the endeavour as well as the daring involved in the thought of its realisation. And if there is necessarily included within the scope of the general Messianic hope the special hope of a conquest of all the heathen and their empires, at this time the power of Israel as a nation had long been profoundly humbled after the first victories of the Maccabees; and the terrible power of the Romans, in whose empire the nation appeared to be more and more completely absorbed, had, especially after the quelling of the rising of the Gaulonite, become as clear as possible to every eye even in the most hidden corner of the sacred land. If, therefore, the undying hope of Israel could never wholly perish, and if it now also stirred in the hearts of many sincere individuals, as was shown above,[2] it appeared nevertheless, in the eyes of the wise and prudent, either never so far from realisation or, on account of the bitter national experiences of the last years, never so dangerous as now. There still seemed to be nowhere any tangible support for this blessed hope. The house of David had long ago been so far broken up that it was no longer recognisable;[3] neither was there any other eminent

[1] Nothing more than this is implied in the hope, which is put into the foreground, of the coming of 'the prophet' 1 Macc. iv. 46, xiv. 41, comp. ix. 27 (vol. v. pp. 178, 361 sq.). The hope of the Messiah is thereby in no wise denied or dispensed with, but that only placed before it which had (acc. to p. 106) long been conceived as preceding the coming of the Messiah.

[2] P. 90, and as also appears from the reminiscences of the Baptist in the New Testament, from John i. 42 sq., and other indications. The hope had even spread to the Samaritans, acc. John iv. 25 sq.; see on this latter point vol. vi. [German].

[3] See *ante*, pp. 109 sq..

house left with which it could be connected; the heart of the wise men of the day had grown cold towards it, if not wholly estranged; and the heavens into whose spaces it had for centuries been removed, seemed as if they would never open to effect its realisation. It is true that no school and no civil authority in Israel could destroy or even deny it; nevertheless, after all the numerous painful experiences, the hope seemed to have itself become hopeless; and if the wise people of the time were unable to forget it, they were still unwilling to occupy themselves with it in any earnest way.[1]

But what is the use of even the most necessary, richest, and most fruitful hope if it remains simply a hope? It becomes at last either wholly idle and vain, or, if at some time it is more warmly and eagerly, but unintelligently and perversely taken up, it too easily leads to the most baneful attempts. Accordingly a first duty with regard to it is to seek to enter more particularly into its meaning, and to accurately understand what it presupposes and demands, and also to carry it out; indeed, a first duty is to prepare for some beginning of its fulfilment, and at last to bring it about if possible. And if it is such a perfectly sublime hope, and ultimately concerns so directly the future and the weal of a whole nation, as is the case with the Messianic hope, it is necessary that even an entire nation, the more difficult its realisation seems, should deem no trouble and sacrifice too high that the aim may gradually be approached to which it points. For that which in a case like this takes the form of prophetic anticipation, hope, and longing when viewed as thought and endeavour, is, when looked at with regard to the matter itself, an inward necessity and consequence to which the entire past history leads up, and a goal, the falling short of which involves the loss of all the best possessions which have been won in the long, toilsome life and struggle of a nation. And though the aim is so sublime and its attainment so difficult, that one man only, and he endowed with capacity beyond all others, can reach it, still even this man cannot come unless, as is always possible, the whole nation itself already tends towards the high aim, and to all it is more or less clearly evident what the aim really is and how hard it is to reach.

In no other instance does all this hold more truly than in that of the hope which was the most sublime and difficult of

[1] This follows from all the remains and traces of those times, most plainly also from the comprehensive writings of Philo and Josephus; see further *ante*, pp. 99, sq.

fulfilment of any that ever made itself felt in human history—the Messianic hope. Precisely when it had reached its highest purity and the necessity of its realisation was the greatest, its aim seemed so infinitely distant and difficult of attainment, that it required a new, most intense effort, if possible of the whole nation, to be able even in general to approach somewhat nearer to it. This, therefore, must be accomplished as the condition, which in point of historical development is the third, but is in reality the first, if the realisation of this hope was to be finally looked for. Men, first of all, had so to accustom themselves, with new and deep feeling, to the thought of the fulfilment of the hope and of its great desirability, that they would immediately attempt everything possible, and do whatever they could provisionally, with a view to preparing for this fulfilment and removing the hindrances in its way. Even the most daring and most difficult undertaking which is involved in the endeavour to realise such a hope had to be set about with the most intense exertion of all the energies of faith and action, although everything involved in the hope might not be attained at once. Whether many or few, though it were in thought and preparation only, should be inclined for such a high undertaking, it was only when attempted with true earnestness and when the most difficult task itself was thus gradually approached, that the goal also could be more definitely perceived by degrees, and the right way to it taken. And amongst the thousands which had now from a distance approached at all events nearer the true problem, it might be that the man who was alone fitted to realise it might be found, and who, now under the closer sympathy and more intelligent attention of all, would so solve it that it would be solved not for himself alone, but (upon which everything ultimately depended) for all, and he would forthwith find a sufficient number of souls not wholly unprepared who would be able to follow him. And if there was here at all an infinitely great problem to solve, and if there was anything behind this hope and desire of the long line of ages (for to seek after the true religion was generally the work of the whole pre-Christian world) at all worthy of it, it was only from the fulfilment of this last condition that it could be successfully approached and the mystery be gradually penetrated.

Now, the same thing occurred in the case of this third condition as was observable with regard to the two previous ones. That is, now, as then, everything which is necessarily required by the general course of the development of the great thought and the purely Divine fact of this entire history,

often makes itself felt many centuries previously as prophetic anticipation and true prediction. This is particularly the case in the present instance, inasmuch as we have here precisely the angle at which those first two conditions converge. We saw above[1] how the Deuteronomist spoke of a great future prophet of Israel who would not be inferior to Moses, and to whose voice everyone would have to hearken. Because he was unwilling in his representation of the legal condition and the continued existence of the ancient constitution to speak of a Messiah in the sense of Isaiah, and nevertheless already observed plainly enough the growing weakness of the ancient prophetism, he thus spoke of a future prophet. In the case of Ezekiel it is very remarkable that he, as little as Jeremiah, let go the belief in the coming of the Messiah; but clearly perceiving how difficult his coming would be, and that it must be prepared for by Divine powers of an entirely different kind, he makes the commencement of the great change for the better to depend upon the presence of a genuine prophet, who may least of all be absent, and must, above all men, be heard as the true warner in the times of greatest storms and agitation.[2] And in the case of the great anonymous prophet near the end of the exile, who for special reasons avoids speaking of a Messiah in the earlier sense, unmistakably all the more is expected of the new, inspired labours of great prophets in Israel, and the ideal of the perfect godly man, as he must henceforth be in Israel, is portrayed in marked prophetic colours.[3] So certain is it that the hope of the Consummation, if for any reason it is at any time immediately directed less to the highest ideal of the the Messiah, expected all the more from a higher revival of the prophetic power, as the second, and, indeed, more immediate and necessary creative influence, and that it demanded the more imperatively this power. But as the Hagiocracy, which was without prophets, advanced, the Messianic hope lost more and more its first freshness and energy, and it became ever clearer how little the present, with all its petty and irreconcilable internal contentions and sects, was prepared for the immediate presence of the Messiah in his glory. It was then for the first time that the desire definitely arose that one of the great prophets of olden times might return to cure the nation beforehand of its internal defects, and to direct its heart to the Divine love and true perfection, in order that the highest King and Lord, if he

[1] P. 106.

[2] Ezek. xxxiii. 2 sq., with the corresponding passages, according to the correct view of the arrangement of the materials in Ezekiel's book.

[3] 'Isa.' l. 4–11.

should come (and that he would come was really considered certain), need not direct against Israel simply punitive and destructive righteousness. As, therefore, formerly Samuel's prophetic labours in preparing the hearts of the people for him, had preceded the work of David in thoroughly establishing the kingdom, so now the memory of Samuel, in conjunction with that of Moses, rose into high estimation.[1] But inasmuch as at that time Elijah was already looked upon as the prophetic spirit, ever living and ever ready to help, Malachi at last expressed this new hope in the more definite form, that before His great arrival the Lord would send Elijah to prepare His way;[2] in connection with which announcement the tendency was to put the Messiah as such into the background, in conformity with the spirit of those Persian times. It was only thereby that the series of all these hopes was really completed in such a way that their fulfilment could now be calmly waited for. It is true that this hope of the coming of a great prophet was put most prominently forward only when, for special reasons, the already highly-developed hope of the Messiah once more somewhat receded; hence in the books of Daniel and Enoch, in which the Messiah stands forth again so vividly in fresh kindled hope, it is wholly absent; whilst in actual, sober life, where the more immediate prospect must always take precedence of the more distant one, it became now, on the contrary, more and more established.[3] And generally the result only in its exceedingly important progress could show how the various hopes, which had been formed in the most dissimilar situations of the nation during so many centuries, might actually be realised. However, a settled prospect had now been gained as to what was to be expected and to be done in case the chasm between the happy hope of the coming of the Messiah and the miserable condition of the nation should be too wide; and for this preliminary condition also, if it should have to be complied with, a prophetic connection and demand had been supplied.

[1] Jer. xvi. 1; Ps. xcix. 6.

[2] Mal. iii. 1, 23, 24 [A.V. iv. 5, 6], comp. vol. v. p. 178. It is undeniable that the Messiah here has his place completely taken by God, and this withdrawal is not in this case accidental, but is so connected with the historical circumstances, described above and in the previous volume, that we must say that this prophet intentionally avoided speaking of him. Still, the manner in which the coming of the Lord Jahveh to judgment, iii. 2, 3, is described, and the designation of the coming one, ver. 1, as the one sought and longed for, are taken from such decidedly human similes, that it is plain enough that the prophet had Messiah himself in his mind, and that he could have easily mentioned him if certain reasons had not dissuaded him. Jahveh and the Messiah accordingly are so intimately blended in his mind, that the first, as the ultimate and highest one, alone remains in his glory and brightness.

[3] Vol. v. p. 361.

Now, it is true, that the genuine prophetism of Israel had at this time been long ago outlived;[1] it had also been associated with too peculiar conditions, and had too completely accomplished its immediate object, to make the revival of it in its previous form possible. So that in this case also nothing but the realisation itself could show in what manner it was now capable once more of revival. Yet the anticipation and settled expectation of its coming once more even in a strengthened form, was justified by the great ultimate matter itself as above described, and was justified also by the inward tendency of the whole history of Israel from its very commencement. For as prophetism alone had from the first created and founded everything in Israel—true religion, the kingdom, national power, and eternal hope—so, when everything in this nation had exhausted itself and tended to its decease, everything must once more make a strong endeavour to revert again to prophetism as the primary impulse and force of the Community, that it might appear whether it, as the last historical power which was in this case possible, could promote the coming of the mysterious Consummation which had been so long and so painfully yearned for in this nation. The same phenomena, therefore, which met us at the end of each of the two previous phases of this entire history, namely, that in all the most decisive periods of this Community everything reverts to the prophetic power as its primary force,[2] must be repeated here for the third time, though certainly in a different manner from before, because it was the highest conceivable Consummation itself which was now sought for, and which alone could produce, further blessing.

The Fulfilment of the Christian (Messianic) Hope and the Motive of it.

The germ, therefore, of the Consummation could shoot forth upon this perfectly spiritualised soil of the true religion only through the Messiah (Christ); the realisation of the Messianic hope became possible only by the fulfilment of the three conditions above explained. But it is equally certain that now everything most strongly urged the immediate fulfilment of these conditions of the realisation of the ancient hope, and in the long line of centuries no time could and must become so distinctly and so necessarily that of their final fulfilment as the present.

For as was above shown at length, the career of the ancient,

[1] See vol. v. *passim*.

[2] Vol. ii. pp. 423 sq.; iv. pp. 290 sq.

i.e. the true religion, as it had historically developed itself from the time of the foundation of its Community under Moses, had now as good as gone through all its stages and almost exhausted its living energies. All the new truths and new saving virtues which it could win upon the basis of its historical commencement and amalgamate with itself, had now been long since powerfully operative, without really bringing that new truth and virtue which alone could now help, and by a new still higher life rescue also the best of the ancient possessions; and, as if with an increasingly clear consciousness of its own growing weakness, it had already transferred in hope to the future, and indeed, to heaven, all the highest things that it distinctly longed for and yet could not any more derive from its own resources. On the other hand, all the errors and fatal elements that could find a place in the ancient religion had likewise been long since fully developed, including the very last error of the Gaulonite, which as soon as it should take hold of the whole nation would threaten the final inevitable destruction of this Community and all its treasures. Accordingly the longed-for new element of salvation must come now or never. The last opportunity had arrived; only the final voluntary impulses, resolves, and deeds were pending; everything tended urgently from all sides to an immediate termination. And if there was anything undying in Israel capable of miraculously renewing even its senescent frame and of conferring upon it the power to live a new and much higher life in a purified form, just as it was threatened with outward destruction, now was the time when this must be shown. A feeling, more or less clear, of the approaching close of the old and of the necessary formation of something new has been for some time seen to pervade the most dissimilar endeavours and movements which are still met with in the ancient religion.[1] Even the Essenes had in their way already abandoned the ancient religion in essential matters, and attempted, in part wrongly but in part with some success, to establish something new.[2] The study of the Law, too, with all the zeal now expended on it in the learned schools, tended to necessitate a final clear esti-

[1] In his last work, *Gott und die Bibel*, vol iii. p. 326, the author supplies the following addition and illustration to this statement. 'How everything tended powerfully in that time to a close of the ancient history and to a final crisis, may also be seen from the fact that for the first time that age was flooded with general surveys and chronological calculations of all conceivable history according to jubilee years and jubilee millenniums, etc. For instance, the books of Daniel, Enoch, Jubilees, Assumption of Moses, 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, &c.'—Tr.

[2] According to what was shown above, vol. v. pp. 370–78, comp. the supplement to those remarks, *ante*, p. 10, and the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vii. p. 190, viii. 210, 230.

mate of the ancient religion and institutions, and even led reluctantly to much that was new. And the fiery zeal of the Gaulonites for the Law urged on most violently some decisive solution of the growing perplexity of the affairs of Israel.

And the purest and noblest elements that had ever lived and moved in Israel for thousands of years, must not they have stirred themselves at this right final moment, must not they have put forth the profoundest forces that still lay hidden within them, and have attempted the highest things yet possible to them? In the life of every nation of higher culture, moments arrive when once more, just before a last limited opportunity, the most essential things that it lacks are presented to it in the clearest outlines, and, with death already staring it in the face, it is able once more to reflect and decide whether or no it will, although it may cost the greatest conflict, cast off the fatal influences which on all sides entangle it, and seize that which is essential for future weal, with a firm faith and unwearying effort. But upon Israel there now looked down long ages of a most exalted and wonderful history. All its innumerable saints, prophets, priests, and kings of ancient times, with the memory of the highest treasures which any nation can at any time obtain for a lasting possession,—the memory of the covenant with the true God, of the existence of the true Community and of the possession of a multitude of the most immortal truths,—were higher voices addressing Israel. They aroused it and gave it no rest until it should attain the Consummation which they all demanded, and should behold the mysterious hope of the ages fulfilled; they permitted it to rest the less now, the more it saw all that was most dear to it threatened with an imminent eternal destruction. The most undying portion of the ancient literature also had now been more securely collected and rendered more sacred, as if solely to remind the nation more urgently of the Consummation which was demanded by and indicated in it. The faint lustre of an ancient but revived Israel, as it had risen again from the ruins of the first destruction but had not properly flourished, seemed now to have once more shone radiantly, in order to call attention to the duty of securing the eternal treasures of this Community by giving them an immortal and higher existence. And was, then, all true life already so exhausted in the life of this Community that nothing further remained but the threatening spread of the ruin caused by the Zealots of the Law, and thereby, in the end, everlasting death? Did there not, by virtue of its very foundation and its prehistoric, essential spirit, exist in it some-

thing immortal which had hitherto never reached proper development, and which yet had long desired a revival and a new form, with which he who should bring the longed-for Consummation need only put himself in connection? Times such as these call forth, as with irresistible force and with surprising rapidity, all that is deepest and most hidden which still lies unexhausted in the thoughts and deeds of a nation, that it may appear whether there remains anything at all that can give help. But in the case of this nation there was something behind that could not lie hidden in any other ancient people, and which might even make its outward destruction the immediate cause of the rise of something infinitely better.

It is true, as was shown above, that all the great existing divisions and separately-developed powers of the nation were, without exception, too one-sided and perverse to bring 'the salvation of Israel'[1] and to realise its 'hope.'[2] The only thing which was certain to the profounder minds as well as to the prevalent view was, that salvation must come from Judah,[3] according to a common popular belief, which was not without its deeper reasons, as we saw above that in Judah only, and not in Samaria or elsewhere, the thread of the general development of Israel had remained strong enough to be able to stand the strain involved in all that it had yet to be subjected to. But above all these divisions stood, after all, the Community (or the nation, as may also be said in this case) itself, with its innumerable members and its immeasurable unknown energies. From its mysterious centre the most unlooked-for things might yet emerge, which had been impossible to all former sects and divisions, and which, as soon as they actually appeared, were incomprehensible to them, and, indeed, perhaps incompatible with them. Truly, if this had not been a Community of the true religion and had not had a previous history of some fifteen centuries, that could never have happened. But here, at last, we see in the highest example what this Community, by virtue of its first foundation[4] as well as in consequence of its long history, really was. We see how little all the ancient sacred priests, all the Biblical scholars and potentates, were regarded when the matter at issue was the eternal truths and their defence; and we see with what wonderful confidence and power it could inspire and render victorious even its most insignificant and despised members, when they correctly perceived

[1] Matt. i. 21, Luke i. 69–71, 77, and many other passages.

[2] Comp. the re-echo in the words Matt. xii. 21, from the Old Testament.

[3] Which is simply thus expressed most briefly and forcibly, John iv. 22, after Isa. ii. 3 and other passages.

[4] Vol. ii. pp. 135 sq.

what was essentially necessary, and permitted it to operate purely according to its own nature.

It is also obvious that the Consummation would have to come during the national existence of this Community, and, indeed in its midst and under its protection. For this Community only possessed either the deep root hidden under the earth, or the sublime, luminous hope and anticipation of the Consummation; in it only could this bright beam from above cause the deep root to push forth the living germ into the full light of day, and in it only were found the manifold different forces which had been sufficiently prepared and had enough energy actually to produce the longed-for perfection. And if, moreover, every germ which is already vigorously growing up in the light, however full of vitality it may be, needs nevertheless sheltering quiet that it may first grow strong and be able to defy future storms, so nothing but the sanctity and further peaceful existence of this Community could permit that germ to grow up and become strong which was destined to spring forth in it alone from the prepared ground. Undoubtedly the true religion in that shelter which it had erected for itself in this nation had long since grown so strong that in generally seeking to attain its own highest perfection it tended to break through the narrow limits of this its first abode and to pass out into a larger freer region. That it must some day become the religion of all heathen nations also had been foretold by the great prophets even during the time of the ancient kingdom; and what Isaiah had proclaimed regarding this point in his last wonderful words,[1] was simply in its way the most perfect and noblest utterance that proceeded from the spirit of these prophets. Indeed, the great anonymous prophet, who prophesied towards the end of the Exile, had even foreseen already that some day from the heathen themselves priests would come for Jahveh, not less acceptable to him than the hereditary Levites.[2] And, with mightiest voice of all, the Baptist now declares, that no boasting of Abraham and the other holy forefathers will avail, that even from the stones God can raise up children of Abraham, i.e. true godly people.[3] The system of proselytism, too, imperfect as it had hitherto been, was really a commencement of the breaking down of the old limitations, as will be further shown below. Still all this had as yet been far from actually breaking down the close limitations which shut in the Israel of that as of earlier times; and Israel was still in that respect on which in this

[1] See vol. iv. pp. 188 sq.; comp. from almost the same time, Ps. lxxvi 11, 12.

[2] 'Isa.' lxvi. 18–21.

[3] Matt. iii. 9, 10.

case everything depended—in respect of its religion—a nation strictly separated from others, and a nation boasting of this its separation and singularity.

And on that account it was further like a specially favourable arrangement from heaven that this period, with the description of which we are occupied, continued, as we have seen, on the whole so calm and free from storms that, especially as it was far removed from the centres of government of the day, it permitted free development in every form and allowed many things to grow up quietly which could when they had come to perfection be of great importance to the world at large. There was still settled quietly in the ancient sacred land a population strongly attached to their native soil and thickly covering it,[1] with traditionary sacred customs and manners of life, and which in spite of previous and perpetuated corruptions, dispersions, and losses, could still be regarded as the nucleus of a people of Israel. As the true religion is not for individuals only, but for the whole nation and the whole human race, and was formerly only able to establish itself within a whole nation, so the perfected religion also must still originate within the sacred limits of a nationality and a genuine national Community, to make it possible for it to arise at all in the earth forthwith as a Community, i.e. as an affair concerning every man, and in future to be extended perhaps so as to become a Community of all nations, which were all on an equality with regard to it. That this was actually accomplished was probably due in no slight degree to the satisfied tranquillity, and the increasing prosperity connected therewith, far as this was from opulence and luxury, which the people of Israel once more enjoyed during these years.

Thus the great fulfilment actually came at last; we shall soon see amid what special efforts and struggles, what labours and sacrifices. For the accomplishment of a matter is something quite different from the possibility of its attainment. And if we were compelled to admire the hope and the great spiritual effort which was most closely connected with it, to which the people of this history rose at last with increasing decision, we shall soon still more admire its actual fulfilment if we now succeed in looking at and discerning it correctly. Certainly there lies between the two—hope and its realisation—a mysterious reciprocal charm: the purer the former is, the purer also must be the shape which the latter assumes, and the more sublime the first, the more glorious and surprising the second,

[1] See *ante*, p. 90.

if it arrives at all; the one is the condition, the provocation, and attraction of the other. Yet this power of hope to produce its fulfilment is limited. For wholly different energies are required for the accomplishment of the latter; and what form the longed-for new work must take, no longing and hope can estimate and determine beforehand in detail, because that form must follow immediately the eternal Divine necessities, which remain beyond the mere hope and longing even of the most godly men. And thus, on the one hand, in no history is it so clearly and grandly taught as in this what hope and its fulfilment are in their mutual relations, precisely because it is the highest subject around which this history centres; but, on the other hand, nowhere else can we perceive so clearly as in this highest illustration what the execution and the toil, what the greatest sacrifice and the greatest victory, which are involved in such a hope, really are, and through what stages the struggle, which was from the beginning most necessary and fraught with victory, must pass.

However, if we finally take a glance at the human instruments and representatives of the Consummation, it came now in the first instance in the ancient Community, and soon passed from it into the rest of the world, in the way which was alone possible according to what we have above seen. The learned schools of the day and the other high authorities of the time had become as incapable of producing it as the Essenes in their onesidedness and dislike of publicity; indeed, they were unable to do so much as protect it properly in its growth.[1] The thought of the Consummation and the desire of its realisation had to retreat into the farthest depths and hidden corners of the great Community, that its germ might be received and cherished in that mysterious soil, which was with difficulty accessible to the foot or the eye, and apparently so quiet, though, after all, easily agitated. The thoughts, desires, and efforts which are chased from the surface often rest, collect themselves, and revive again in an unexpected manner on this deep, firm, and extended basis of every nation and every community as well as of the human race. They retreat thither if they find nowhere else a place, and often rise thence with an irresistible power, such as is entirely unsuspected by the authorities of the day. For such thoughts and aims generally find in these sections of society the simplest, most unspoiled, and unprejudiced minds, the most receptive and purest convictions, the most undaunted and cheerful enterprise, and the force most free of all the rooted

[1] Comp. what Paul says so truthfully, 1 Cor. i. 26–28.

perversities of the schools and the authorities of the time. And, moreover, it was always this particular Community, with its peculiar powers, duties, and hopes, coming down from primitive times, in whose deep mysterious basis this germ formed itself in secret, until it had become so strong that it had no longer any need to avoid the brightest light of publicity. Indeed, in this respect also this Community reverted now to its commencement. For as the Community of Israel itself arose at first only from the lowest abyss of mortal suffering and conflict,[1] so now its Consummation struggles upwards from a similar, only a still deeper, depth.

THE GERMINATING SEED OF THE CONSUMMATION.

Christ's Entrance into the World.

The Sources of this History.

The unequalled importance to us of this history itself requires that we should examine the more carefully the extent, the age, and the exact nature of its sources. And with a view to this object it might at first sight seem to be a great advantage that this history falls in the midst of the Roman Empire and the broad, clear light of its history, so that we should be entitled in this case to expect to get the fullest and most trustworthy sources for it from the most various quarters. However, within the limits of the largest of the ancient empires even much occurred which went by in sight of the wide world as if for a long time unobserved. And generally the first delicate seeds of Christianity, as was above observed, go back into a deep, mysterious soil, for which the various political powers of that time had neither heart nor understanding, and to whose fruit they only gradually found themselves compelled to pay some attention, after it had already begun here and there to force itself into view. This origin, with its most peculiar characteristics, and this earliest development of Christianity, must not, in the case of any of the sources of its primitive history, including those of a Christian origin, ever be overlooked: an origin so withdrawn from the world's eye must exert a great influence on these sources themselves.

In particular we may lament that we possess scarcely any reports sufficiently early and trustworthy from a non-Christian source regarding the life and labours of Christ; but this cannot

[1] See vol. ii. *passim*.

greatly surprise us. No history, as will soon appear, can have gone by in greater retirement from the noise of the world, and, till towards its end, more unnoticed, than that of the brief public labours of Christ. He did not enter even so much as the Baptist into the public life of the nation of his time; he lived withdrawn from the loud noisy life of the whole contemporary world simply for God as his Father and for the foundation of the perfect kingdom of God; and his spirit, which was so incomprehensible to that world, appeared to be for ever most ignominiously extinguished and annihilated immediately, almost before it had quite begun to unfold itself in this world. Even through the next period, after that violent extinguishment, this mysterious noiselessness of the new spirit in the world is continued, until it gradually permeates it with irresistible force, and then Jews and heathen soon enough find much to say of it, whilst they had let the time go by unused when they could have informed themselves most accurately about Christ.

1. As regards heathen sources we might not unreasonably, in the first place, expect that in the Annals of the Roman Empire, in which everything more than usually remarkable, even from the provinces, could be entered, some particulars regarding Christ would have been reported, at all events under the year of his death. But if we compare the 'Annals' of Tacitus, under the year 33 A.D., in which (as will be shown) this death according to all probability fell, we find nothing mentioned there; and most likely simply because Tacitus at this time altogether despised Christianity, and accordingly deemed it sufficient to say briefly what was necessary about Christ when he came to the point at which he could not avoid speaking of the Christians —that is, in the history of Nero. That Pilate made a report to Tiberius as to Christ's death may, indeed, be credited; but the *Acta Pilati* concerning Christ, which was accepted early in the second century A.D., was, according to all indications, composed as a fiction towards the end of the first century by some literary Christian.[1] And thus, at present, Tacitus and the younger Pliny appear to be the first heathen authors from whom anything in writing concerning Christ has been preserved,[2] unless the *Mara son of Serapion*, who expresses himself in a very remarkable manner concerning 'Christ, the wise king of the Jews,' as early as about the year 74 A.D., was not so much

[1] Comp. the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* vi. pp. 49 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* vol. i. pp. 154 sq.] with the addition in Rufinus' Latin translation of Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* ix. 6, and the *anakephalosis* appended to Hegesippus, *De Bello Judaico*, ad fin.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97.

a Christian as a heathen well disposed towards Christianity. His testimony, which was only recently discovered, is, in any case, very noteworthy on account not only of its early date, but also of its ingenuous simplicity and its elevated characteristics.[1] The subsequent inquiries and remarks of the heathen writers in the course of the second century, regarding the origin of Christianity and the life of its founder, proceeding from various but mostly unintelligent and hostile motives, are based upon such an insane medley of New Testament narratives, Jewish prejudices, and the writers' own baseless conjectures, that they are scarcely worthy of serious attention, particularly as, with the growing opposition between Heathenism and Christianity, they became more and more turbid and bitter.[2]

2. Of Jewish writers, Josephus is at present the earliest we possess of the first century who speaks of Christ. In the first of his two chief works—the 'History of the Jewish War'—indeed, he did not refer to him, nor was he obliged to do so by the main subject of his work.[3] But it is not easy to see how he could in his 'Antiquities' avoid even a brief reference to him and his followers, inasmuch as he mentions many things of much less importance, and this work was meant from the first to supply a general history of the nation, with all its aims, various divisions, and manifold vicissitudes. If in this great work also he had said nothing of Christianity, the omission could only have been ascribed to serious ignorance and misconception regarding it, which had so misled him that he preferred to pass over in silence a matter of the existence of which he was so well aware. Certainly when he wrote his works for the Roman-Greek world he had a secret horror of everything Messianic; and as to all Judeans of his own way of thinking, so to him, Christianity must have been either something incomprehensible or something unpleasant and objectionable, inasmuch as the injury which this latest sect had already caused to the Judean system was felt to be great. Yet it is not easy to see how he should on such grounds have been able entirely to pass it by without any notice. Now, as a fact, we find in all manu-

[1] Comp. on this epistle, vol. vii. pp. 30–32 [Germ. 2nd ed.].

[2] The most important part of what was written in this respect by heathen, according to Celsus (in Origen) and Lucian in his writings, is found summarily noted in Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* v. 2 sq. One monstrous confusion and invention in particular, the traces of which are somewhat difficult to follow (namely, that Jesus had been a robber, probably an intentional confounding of him and Barabbas, with regard to which subsequently in connection with the crucifixion), indicates the nature of the whole of these hostile references.

[3] Similarly, and certainly also from the same cause, his contemporary Justus, in his work on the same subject, mentioned below, vol. vii. p. 108 [Germ.], left the Christians unnoticed, according to the statements of Photius.

scripts of the 'Antiquities' two obviously corresponding passages, in the first of which he speaks of Christ and His followers; in the second, of the execution of James the brother of Christ;[1] but the first and longest of the two passages betrays manifestly a Christian hand. There is also in the nature of the case every reason for admitting that an alteration by Christian hands was very possible. For the works of Josephus, from the very first written not for Judeans but rather for heathen, soon fell, in consequence of the subsequent fortunes of the nation, into heathen, and still more into Christian, hands alone, and early became to Christians a chief source of their historical knowledge generally. It is no wonder, therefore, that a prominent Christian should early alter a passage found therein concerning Christ in such a way that the book could be read by Christians, and that this alteration should pass into all Christian manuscripts (other manuscripts have not been preserved). In recent times many scholars have, without sufficient reason, supposed that the entire passage was inserted in the text of the work without any occasion, and is therefore totally and in every word spurious.[2] If Josephus had not spoken of Christ at all, that would have been of little importance, inasmuch as it never occurred to a Christian of the first or the second century to think the historical truth of Christ required confirmation by Josephus. But there is as little reason for supposing that the Christian hand met with nothing that might be objected to in Josephus[3]; in that case, whatever was unobjectionable and suitable for reading would have been left as it was, without attempting to make it a little more Christian by a few slight additions. We have, on the contrary, every reason to suppose, first, that Josephus, according to a view then common among Judeans and heathen, de-

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 3. 3, and on the occasion of the execution of James the Just as the brother of Jesus, xx. 9. 1; the second passage merely refers back to an earlier mention of Christ, and in so far lends its support to the first passage, unless it is itself regarded as spurious.

[2] Imman. Bekker, in his last edition of Josephus, marks the entire passage, *Ant.* xviii. 3. 3, as spurious. But a reason for the supposition of a wholly spurious insertion of the entire passage would be forthcoming only if we were at the same time compelled to suppose that Josephus had not regarded the appearance and also the crucifixion of Christ as a national calamity and had not thus described them here. For in that case, §§ 4, 5, in which he mentions the evils that befell the Jews, mentioned *ante*, pp. 82 sq., would have to be immediately connected with the other calamity, § 2, as the first. But we have no reason to make such a supposition regarding Josephus, as we have seen above; and in this passage Josephus may very well have described in succession *three* 'terrible' events which at that time occurred near together. The sentence καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει . . . . ἀγαπήσαντες is quite in the manner of Josephus, and τὸ φῦλον in the last sentence he uses also, *Con. Apion.* ii. 11, in the meaning of a *class of men* or *people*.

[3] This would be the inference from the view of Gieseler (*Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. pp. 81 sq., ed. of 1844), [Eng. Trans. § 24] who supposes it possible to restore the original text simply by striking out some sentences and detached words.

scribed Christ, since he could not wholly pass him and his followers by without notice, as a mere magician (*γόης*), who had by such arts as well as by other pretensions misled the people, and appeared dangerous to those in power, and had also been justly sentenced by them to be crucified.[1] And, secondly, there is equally good reason for believing that, with most intelligent Judeans of his time, although disliking Christianity as a superstition, he nevertheless greatly lamented the division in the Judean nation which had been caused by it, and wished that the capital punishment inflicted upon James the brother of Jesus had not taken place.[2] It is true that in his disapproval of that act the old antagonism between the Pharisees and Sadducees might have some influence, since Josephus was a Pharisee; but although Annas,[3] at whose instigation, and that of his son-in-law Caiaphas, Christ was crucified, adhered with his whole family to the Sadducees,[4] yet, in the case of Christ, the circumstances properly appeared to him of another kind, inasmuch as he had been 'crucified by Pilate on the accusation of the chief men (that is, of the whole Chief Council),' accordingly had not been executed, as James was subsequently, without regard to the ordinary course of law. Now, the Christian hand made the most decided alteration in the character of this description, and left standing only two or three shorter sentences, in which the original language of Josephus, as far as it was passable for Christian readers, is still well-nigh unmistakable.[5]

[1] Very much as Celsus, if not so pronounced and hostile (see Origen, *Con. Cels.* i. 28, 38, from whom Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* iv. 15, v. 3, and later writers draw their materials), and as Lucian spoke about Christ. Everywhere and on every occasion Josephus speaks most strongly against *γόητες*, false prophets, and others; with manifestly always a certain reference to Christianity, which had then become well known, as was the case also with Lucian only fifty years later.

[2] As appears from the second passage, *Ant.* xx. 9. 1. It is true that in recent times in this passage, too, it is wished to strike out the words *τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ. . . . ἑτέρους*; but these words are not merely such as a Christian, but also such as Josephus himself could have written, and, if they are erased, the passage is made obscure and incomplete. For then Josephus would wholly omit to say definitely in what respect these *τινες* had transgressed the law, although he himself regards the matter as very serious. Indefiniteness of such a kind and such an inexplicable omission would be here quite unexpected, and would not be in Josephus' manner, since he had no ground whatever for such a want of precision in this case. The fact that this account of the execution of James the Just appears not to accord with that of Hegesippus, preserved by Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23, and with some others, particularly as regards the chronology, is no reason for treating the passage in Josephus with suspicion; on the contrary, if it had been inserted by a Christian hand, the discrepancy would have been the more surprising, supposing Hegesippus supplied the prevalent Christian account.

[3] See *ante*, p. 64.

[4] See *Jos. Ant.* xx. 9. 1; comp. with Acts iv. 6, v. 17, xxiii. 2 sq.

[5] Of the original text of xviii. 3. 3, therefore, all that remains would be something as follows:—*Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῖς . . . . Καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους* to *ἐπηγάγετο . . . . Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει* to *ἀγαπήσαντες . . . . Εἰσέτι τε νῦν* to *φῦλον.*

And without doubt this complete alteration of the passage was made by a Christian hand early in the second century[1]; about which time another Christian hand must have been employed in a similar way in emending Josephus' work on the Jewish War.[2] However, as this latter addition to the work on the Jewish War is not found in our present manuscripts, in like manner the former one in the 'Antiquities' was still absent from some manuscripts even as late as the time of Origen.[3]

Whatever the Jews may have otherwise written before the destruction of Jerusalem about Christ and the Christians, like all their other literary products of that time, perished in the great wreck which they then suffered. It has been above shown in various ways, even in the case of purely Jewish events, how few reliable and adequate reminiscences of the affairs previous to the destruction were subsequently preserved in the Talmudic writings. After the complete separation of the two religions an unhistorical spirit very soon got the upper hand; in this quarter no one desired to get a connected, trustworthy history of Christ; simply what was wholly disconnected, legendary, and untrustworthy was seized upon. What has been thus thought and recorded in a narrow-minded and hostile sense

[1] The passage is quoted from Josephus exactly as it is found in our present MSS. in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* i. 11, *Demonst. Evang.* iii. 5.

[2] That is, Origen, *Con. Cels.* i. 47, ii. 13, and Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23, quote the following sentence as taken from Josephus: *ταῦτα δὲ συμβέβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, ἐπειδήπερ δικαιότατον αὐτὸν ὄντα οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπέκτειναν.* This sentence, as regards the description of James and its whole force, is thoroughly Christian, and has the appearance of having been taken from Hegesippus' account of him. But at present no MSS. of Josephus are known in which the Church Fathers, or in any case, Origen, read the sentence; it had, therefore, at that time been received in some MSS. of Josephus only, which is not surprising, inasmuch as it is spurious. And undoubtedly it was added by a Christian hand to the work on the Jewish War, where it has an appropriate place, as it simply supplies as it were a brief reminiscence from the lengthy account of Hegesippus; although Origen in another work (his *Comment. in Matt.* xiii. 55, tom. iii. p. 563, ed. De la Rue, or iii. p. 46, ed. Lommatzsch), where he quotes the passage not verbatim, refers it to the twenty books of the *Antiquities*.—But it does not at all follow from this sentence that the words concerning James the Just, *Ant.* xx. 9. 1, are also spurious, as the latter may, on the contrary, have supplied the model for the spurious addition, which is so evidently a mere annotation, in the formation of the clause ἀδ. Ἰησ. τοῦ λεγ. Χριστοῦ. Nor from the fact that Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23, accepted both passages concerning James together, can we infer the same origin and the same spuriousness of both.—According to all the evidences at present available, we cannot therefore form any other judgment than the above regarding the two passages of Josephus; and only desire that useless controversies about them may cease. The work of Ernest Gerlach (Berlin, 1863), *Die Weissagungen des A. T. in Josephus' Schriften*, ends once more with their simple rejection, notwithstanding that the work does not give heed to the above essential considerations.

[3] Origen cannot, in his manuscript, have read the passage of the *Antiquities* as it now runs because he never appeals to it; but, on the contrary, speaks of Josephus as an unbeliever, or at least as of one who had not come sufficiently near the truth. Comp. also *Jahrbb. der. B. W.* x. p. 269.

concerning the history of Christ and early Christianity, no longer possesses any historical value.[1] It is true, there is no reason to suppose that these fictitious accounts did not originate amongst the Jews until a somewhat late period. The oldest pieces of the *Gemara*, both of Jerusalem and Babylon, communicate ample material belonging to them, and we know from quite another source—from Origen—that they had before his time circulated amongst the heathen.[2] A close knowledge of this period leaves no ground for doubting that these inventions were due to the burning hatred of those times which led to the war of Bar-cocheba, and that they thus date back to the first decades of the second century, a time when amongst Christians also Evangelistic Literature advanced to rapid deterioration. But the impure spirit in which these, happily already outlived, Jewish accounts originated led by natural consequence to the incredibly base and absurd inventions of the *Sépher tôledôth Jeshua ha Nossri*,[3] written in the Middle Ages, and have thereby been for all time condemned.

3. Of Christian sources it is the four Gospels only which now supply us with the earliest, fullest, and most important materials for this history. The matter contained in the rest of the New Testament, more in the form of incidental reference and passing notice, is derived altogether from the same common stratum of history, and accords in all essential respects perfectly with the four Gospels, but in details it does not present much not found in them. The other oldest Christian writings [4]

[1] E.g. it had been heard that Christ was as a child carried by Joseph into Egypt; it was known that Josua, the son of Perachja, mentioned above, p. 14, had fled thither, and so this Rabbi was made Christ's teacher, who had taken the child with him thither. Comp. these and similar stories in Steinschneider's *Catal. Codd. Hebr. Lugd. Bat.* (1858), pp. 393 sq.

[2] That is, according to Origen (*con. Cels.* i. 32), Celsus already narrates from the same source of the soldier Πανθήρας what the Talmudic writings know and latter writers elaborate of a פנדירא as the actual father of Jesus. This name, *a perfect animal*, was undoubtedly derived from a Greek book which was circulated amongst the Greeks, with the object of creating hatred of Christianity, and the name itself is a play upon the words *υἱὸς παρθένου*. The latter name gave rise from the first to the strongest objections and the most bitter ridicule.

[3] Published by Joh. Jac. Huldricus, Leyden, 1705. A work in which the *εὐαγγέλιον* becomes, by an insipid play upon words but at the same time from the inmost heart of its author, an עָוֹן בְּלִיּוֹן and which can tell the whole history simply in the meaning of this equivocal term, would certainly have been better left unpublished as far as the interests of many of the thoughts and aims of the Jews of our time are concerned, if it did not contain the logical consequences of the stories in the Talmud itself, and simply carry out what the latter presents incidentally and by insinuation! The word עָוֹן or אָוֶן is already found in the Talmud. *Shabbath*, fol. 116*a*, as an allusion to the *evangelium*.

[4] The well-known correspondence between *Abgar* king of Edessa and Christ, spurious as it is, proves simply that Christianity had extended so far comparatively early, and that later this fact was properly boasted of at Edessa. More than this cannot be said, even after the most extensive and earliest narratives on the matter have been published in Cure-

supply more than the Apocryphal Gospels that have been preserved, yet it is only a few historical additions of any importance which we can derive from that source.[1] The main point is therefore to correctly understand and appreciate the historical matter of our four Gospels, if we desire to attain in this field generally to a satisfactory measure of certainty, and to ascertain correctly, and in conformity with the importance of the case, both the least and greatest facts which it is here possible once more to recover.

Now, as in recent and very latest times so many erroneous and injurious views have been presented, and, indeed, zealously defended, regarding the origin and the nature, and accordingly the historical value of these four Gospels, and other works kindred to them,[2] it seemed high time to arrive at a number of ascertained fundamental truths on this question. Accordingly, since the year 1848, I have published my views thereon at considerable length.[3] The positions thus established, and which will be further treated, form the bases of all our knowledge of this history. In the course of this history of the termination of the temporal, terrestrial Israel and of the simultaneous rise of the immortal, spiritual Israel, we shall be obliged repeatedly to refer again to much belonging to this class of Christian documents.

It is, according to the results of my inquiries, pure and simple prejudice which leads many modern scholars to the conclusion that the Evangelical literature generally did not take its rise until quite late. On the contrary, all closer inquiries prove that it began quite early and was developed down to the

ton's *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London, 1864), comp. *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, pp. 1492–98, and Lerubna in Langlois, *Collection des Historiens de l'Arménie*, i. pp. 317–325 (Paris 1867), vol. vi. of this History, p. 533 [German].

[1] Such is, e.g., the mention, which is independent of the Gospels and yet very instructive, of the public works of healing performed by Christ, in Quadratus' Apology before Hadrian, preserved in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iv. 3; it is quite credible that Quadratus had in his youth seen some of those who had been healed by Christ.

[2] With regard to the *Apocryphal Gospels*, I have expressed my view in the *Jahrbb. der. B. W.* vi. pp. 32 sq. [republished in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 135–160] comp. also the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, pp. 1018; 1866, pp. 658, 1089 sq., further B. H. Cowper's *Apocryphal Gospels* (London 1867), and my review of this work, *ibid.* 1867, pp. 1311–16. I shall have to deal further with this whole subject in vol. vii. [German] (*a*).

[*a*. In vol. vii. pp. 351 sq. the author deals with the Christian historical literature of the period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the last Jewish wars, but his last treatment of the Evangelical literature, canonical and apocryphal, is not published in that volume but in the second edition, vol. i. pp. 1–183 of his work, *Die drei ersten Evangelien* (1871).—Tr.]

[3] In the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* from the first number onwards; a continuation of these essays then followed, 1854, in the *sixth* number; in the subsequent numbers of the *Jahrbb.*, as well as on other occasions, I have pursued the matter further. Comp. the Preface to this vol. [and the previous note.—Tr.]

destruction of Jerusalem in the most various forms; but was then, certainly, continued for a considerable time after that event. Still, notwithstanding the abundance and variety of this kind of literature, only two main streams and two main classes of Evangelical narrative, which we must always keep distinct, were formed, so far as the chief and ultimate object of this literature is concerned. That is, when the oldest class of narration had already been very widely developed in writing, and had, moreover, been circulated amongst the Christians of all countries—in fact, had been already established as finished and acknowledged—its proper supplement and completion appeared in the Gospel of John. Not until this Gospel supplied it, did the first class of narration find its completion, whether we look at the highest import and interpretation of the whole history of Christ, or at the numerous details which, though in themselves apparently insignificant, may nevertheless in the end prove of great importance. Verily, the wonderful history of Christ found immediately its scarcely less wonderful form of historical literature; for what in many respects can be more wonderful than even the origin and formation of our Gospels? Men, who if they had not been enlightened by the light of the Gospel itself, would never themselves have thought of writing anything of a literary nature or of attending to literary art, became the founders of an entirely new class of literature, such as the world had never seen before, forcible in its simplicity, brief and yet adequate, unadorned yet telling, narrating the highest things that narrative can communicate, things which children love to hear as well as things of sublime elevation, and unconsciously surpassing thus late all the other noble qualities of Old Testament narrative even. But after this literature had been most variously and dissimilarly developed with the greatest painstaking in a long series of distinct books, and when zeal in its further production as well as its materials appear to be exhausted, then for the first time it receives its proper completion and brightest glorification from a book which taken alone is as important as all the other three earlier ones together; indeed, not only outshines all the earlier ones, but also throws upon and into them the light they needed, and a book which does all this without intending it, purely by virtue of its essential goodness and its contented joy in its great subject itself!

That the fourth Gospel must be traced back to the Apostle John has been, it is true, stoutly denied in Germany in recent times; nevertheless the fact is certain; and since 1826 I have

all along publicly maintained it, and more recently given detailed proof of it.[1] There is only one circumstance that might perhaps shake our faith in this; and I confess that when I became fully aware of it, I was myself for the moment affected by it. That is, we observe that the author not infrequently takes a simpler expression, which is found in one of the earlier Gospels, as the foundation of his own remarks, particularly too in the discourses of Christ. This phenomenon might certainly lead to the conjecture that the work is only from a second hand, however able it may be; as if the author were not the independent Apostle and bosom friend of the Lord, but some one who only by the aid of the earlier Gospels became absorbed in the sublime subject. However, this is in fact appearance only. It is certainly clear that before he began his own work the author read some of the Gospels which were at hand, and precisely the oldest and best of them:[2] but it is not easy to see why the Apostle in his advanced years should not have done that. It could never have occurred to him at such a late period to draw up a Gospel with the indifference of a superior to all those already in existence; and it was quite proper that he should compare the books of a Matthew and Mark-Peter, which then had long been much and widely circulated. In fact, there was all the more reason for this if, as appears from many indications, he did not resolve before he was greatly advanced in years to compose a Gospel by way of supplement to the earlier ones. The perusal of those which had been written much earlier and by men generally most trustworthy, served to awaken more vividly in him the full recollection of the past events, so that many of their words became involuntarily suggestive of his own most personal and vivid representations. And thus every doubt of its derivation from the Apostle John which may arise in the case of this Gospel is in the end resolved when it is more closely examined.[3]

[1] Comp. now also my essay at the end of the second volume of my work on the *Johanneische Schriften* (Gött. 1861–62). Whoever considers that the fourth Gospel is a spurious work ascribed to John has not learnt to distinguish between original and not original, old and new books, and between books written in a simple inartificial style and those written artificially in the name of an earlier and more famous author or holy man. The fourth Gospel does not bear a single trace of having been written in another's name; indeed, it would be impossible even to comprehend what reason an author would have to ascribe it to this Apostle. If Papias (as has recently been inferred from a fragment in a Latin book of the Middle Ages) really testified that John published the Gospel himself in his lifetime, that statement only accords with everything that I have previously said on the matter.

[2] That is, it can be observed that it was only such oldest Gospels, particularly the Collected Sayings and Mark, which he had before him; a fact of importance. Instances in proof will be given below. But if anyone should maintain that the author used Luke, *e.g.*, in this way he would make a great mistake; the passages Luke xxiv. 12, 40, which occur again John xx. 5, 20, are, according to ancient authorities, no part of the original text of Luke.

[3] I see no reason whatever to alter

Now, no unprejudiced mind will deny the simple love of truth and the faithful spirit in which not only our four Gospels, but also without doubt the Gospels that preceded them, were generally written. For the literature of the Gospels was, as I have shown in the essays above referred to,[1] from the very first exceedingly rich and varied, according to the different authors, inasmuch as its great and difficult subject itself could not be so easily exhaustively treated. But in the best period of this literature if one book was designed to supplement in this or that respect, or even partly to correct, another, all the previous ones were equal as regards strict love of truth and the avoidance of every purpose foreign to the subject, and the four which have been preserved are in these respects on a perfect equality. And as the historical books from the best period of the Old Testament,[2] in conformity with the ancient religion, everywhere display the deepest sense of historical truth, notwithstanding all their differences in other respects, how much more these Gospels just after the Power of the purest truth had itself appeared in person on the earth, and most of all in the matter of his own history! But true as all this is, we may never on any account overlook the important fact, that these Gospels, no less than the whole Christian period in which they arose, are still feeling the immediate impression of the great, absolutely unique, and immeasurably exalted Appearance which forms the one subject of their narrative, and that precisely this alone constitutes their greatest merit, that they reflect so faithfully and in such varied aspects the impression which it had made upon the first believers. Nor may we lose sight of the other fact, that this entire history, previous to its entrance into the full light of day, was brought to perfection[3] in a small retired home, as if hidden from all the rest of the great world of the time, and that it now bears in various ways the marks of this sheltered origin. Indeed, this latter circumstance has conferred upon the narrative, as the reflection of the history, notwithstanding the peculiar elevation of the subject, the unrivalled charm of a homely simplicity and loveliness, and at the same time an equally lofty unaffected limitation of view and

this conclusion, although, since I wrote the above [first ed. 1855], Weisse, in his work *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium* (Leipzig, 1856), as well as other less capable writers of the newest kind, seek to deny, from all manner of foolish reasons, the Johannean authorship. Comp. my subsequent references to this point in *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. pp. 100 sq., 186 sq.; xii. pp. 212 sq.; *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, pp. 913 sq., and what has to be further said thereon below in many places.

[1] [See now *Die drei ältesten Evangelien*, i. pp. 1–183.] Tr.

[2] See Vol. i. pp. 53 sq.

[3] See *ante*, pp. 135 sq.

unconcern about all the world such as could scarcely be greater. Moreover, we have seen[1] that, undeniably, in the period in which Christ's brief appearance falls, an exceedingly unhistorical tendency had got the upper hand amongst the surviving remnants of the ancient nation. Precisely the least uncorrupted and most hopeful portion of this nation lived really under the influence either of the elevating recollection of the grand stories of its own antiquity, which, however, were then generally very imperfectly understood, or of the still grander expectations of a supernatural celestial future; and the entire terrestrial existence of the nation had now been strained to the utmost pitch by a vast number of the most exciting experiences and hopes both old and new. The loftiest things that the Sacred Scriptures recorded as done by the greatest ancient prophets and holy men, indeed things very much greater, were expected of him who might appear as the Messiah:[2] and only from this prospect was he encompassed by both the suspicion of the unbelieving and the love of the believing. As therefore this wholly unusual atmosphere, for which the ordinary world had no sense, at once met the Messiah as if it came down from the purest skies, and influenced and supported him, so still more after his glorification were the believers unable to understand him save in this Messianic element, and it was only in its light that they formed their ideas of his whole labours, words, sufferings, and victory. Consequently the total recollection of him as he had appeared must, in the case of the believers, become from the very first a picture most powerfully animated, and as it were enraptured with the purest celestial feelings—indeed, a picture rather heavenly than earthly. Even the smallest details recollected were necessarily lighted up and animated afresh by the bright colours of this light. Finally, there came in addition the sudden violent end of this whole terrestrial Appearance, which had been so brief, and the equally surprising mightier power of the revival of the memory of it which followed upon the first profound despair. By all these things, therefore, there arose a reaction and a form of historical narrative of an unique type, similar to some narratives in the Old Testament, and yet again exceedingly different, but above all incomparably more exalted.

And nevertheless with Christianity, or rather with Christ himself, there had come into the world such a pre-eminent

[1] Vol. v. pp. 460 sq., 471 sq.

[2] As well as of those who should be regarded as continuing his work, 1 Cor. i. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 12.

power of purest truth, and an absolute awe of it such as had never existed before, that not the least untruth intentionally crept into any of these narratives, and not the smallest thing was fictitiously invented therein in the low sense of the word. Only that which was remembered as having actually occurred, or that belonging to the range of this history which had long been established as undoubted knowledge in the very bottom of men's hearts—only that shone forth in this new spirit and new light certainly afresh, and in each case in the manner in which it was possible for it to shine forth afresh in conformity with the sense which was then acknowledged.

All this having been presupposed, it will be found on a careful use of our sources that, although not a few of the minute particles of this general history may now remain for us somewhat obscure, as regards its great primary facts and pure truths they are perfectly adequate. But inasmuch as every part of this history of Israel, and especially the history of Christ himself, has its significance not merely for the first period of its occurrence, but also for our time and for all the future, it is our duty also to look beyond those first impressions which it made, and the limitations which tended to cling to it, into the most original and therefore lasting significance which this whole phenomenon possesses. All the numerous details of the history which the Gospels, and other writings too, to some extent supply, are, as regards this ultimate purpose, but helpful means and contributions; and if the object corresponding to this purpose occupies such a lofty height that we can only gradually approach it with increasing confidence, we must, notwithstanding, never lose sight of it. And as if the necessity had been growingly felt to bring together as many trustworthy sources, precisely for this history with its unique significance, as was possible, we possess for this period of a very few years a greater abundance of various accounts in the Bible itself than for any other period. We saw, indeed, above, in the long course of the history of this nation, how in the case of every one of its more important sections the sources for the knowledge of it also became more abundant—for instance, in the case of David, of Isaiah, and of the Maccabees, and, indeed, as far as this could be, in the case of Moses also; but nowhere have we more abundant sources than for this brief period. And just this abundant variety is in this instance exceedingly instructive, if we only know how to make the right use of it.

Finally, nowhere else does the whole subsequent history so fully coincide, as the strongest and most palpable testimony,

with the various documentary evidence as to the appearance of Christ. The immediately following Apostolic history, extending over a much longer period, proclaims to us, as the peculiar and immediate result and product of his work, how marvellous this appearance, influence, and whole history of Christ must have been; indeed, we feel most plainly the working of the former history in the latter. However incomplete, various, and apparently or really discrepant, therefore, the details of the narratives of the short period of this life may be, it is nevertheless an established fact that the history itself in its general course was of the most wonderful character; and our concern and duty is simply to form for ourselves, from all the details preserved, the most correct picture of the whole phenomenon. After all, the full magnitude, truth, and significance of this, as of every history, does not depend on this or that piece of narrative which has been preserved, or indeed on the various ways of looking at it as a whole; still in this, as in other cases—and particularly in this—even the smallest contribution must be acceptable to us which makes the light of this history once more shine clearly before us.

The Chronology of this History.

Now, as the oldest Gospels generally proceeded from the depths of private feeling and a quiet, homely happiness, such as is the proper mirror of that infinite blessedness which finds its satisfaction in its own resources, they were content to describe the most memorable events in the life of Jesus, with his deeds and discourses, in any simple order that approved itself, without accurately fixing their chronology—indeed, without thinking much about history as far as it did not fall within their sphere of life, or assigning the life of Jesus a place within the general history of the world. That life had both its origin and its course, indeed, quite outside the loud noise of the world, and it was not until its end that the name of a Roman Governor found a place in it. Moreover, at the time when the first and largest number of these Gospels were written, it did not as yet lie very remote, and did not go back into such a dissimilar phase of general history that it became necessary to fix more particularly its chronological boundaries. People knew that these events were as yet of pretty recent date, and that they had taken place within the period during which the Roman rule was quietly continued. It was not until the overthrow of the Cæsarean family and the destruction of Jerusalem that a

change was effected, which was in this respect also necessarily attended by further consequences.

Nevertheless John in his later time still wrote his Gospel with the same perfect unaffectedness and unconcern about the connection of this history with the outer world. It is true that this connection could, in conformity with his way of looking at the facts of Christianity, be to him still more a matter of indifference than to the authors of the older Gospels; nevertheless manifestly the example of his predecessors produced its effect on him, so that he all the more easily neglected a point which seemed to him unimportant in comparison with the infinite grandeur of the things themselves; and, indeed, by the mention of Pontius Pilate, which undoubtedly was never omitted from any Gospel, the period in which this history falls was generally indicated definitely enough. As, however, he was obliged to recall more particularly many things that happened in the course of this history, he nevertheless supplies, incidentally and quite without premeditation, a number of the most valuable contributions in aid of a closer knowledge of the details connected with the events. In fact, if we could not avail ourselves of the aid of this Gospel, we should be left quite in despair as regards a closer chronological arrangement of many of its chief phases. John does not consider it really worth the trouble to name the years either of the whole history or of its separate events, nor to determine his procedure according to a chronological order; but the occasional hints of a chronological nature which he intersperses simply on account of the various details of his narrative, are so definite, so little discrepant in relation to each other, and, when more closely considered, so completely in accord with everything else known to us, that we must go so far as to make them, as being the most trustworthy and instructive, our foundation for the chronology of many chief matters.

With Luke it is quite otherwise, although like John he did not write until after the destruction of Jerusalem. He has, especially as John's Gospel was not as yet before him, no particular chronological details whatever as to events in the course of the history itself, at least, none that could help us in any way to determine with greater chronological accuracy the exact course of these events; but, on the other hand, he takes pains to assign, according to fixed dates, to this entire history its place in the general history of the world. In fact, this was evidently with him a chief purpose of his book; and what he adds in this respect to his sources is just what is quite peculiar to himself. Nor can we fail to see that on this point he made

the most careful inquiries, precisely because this was to him a fresh matter of great importance; and we have only to regret that he after all supplied fewer of such particular chronological notes than we now desire to have. We must, therefore, start from Luke, but when he fails us, make use of the indications supplied by the other sources, and particularly by John.

The notes of time in Luke's Gospel, with the indications of a more incidental nature dispersed through the other Gospels, are, however, of the greater importance for the chronology of this history in general, inasmuch as they are the only ones which we possess from such an early date. People were generally satisfied for a considerable time to state that Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate; as the Gospels prior to Luke, so much more such authors as Josephus [1] and Tacitus [2] have nothing further than this very general chronological reference. The notes of time contained in the Church Fathers, however different they may seem to be, are ultimately derived from Luke and the other Gospels; for even when they seem to fix much more specifically the years—for instance, by the names of the Consuls—really no other sources can be discovered for their views and calculations.

Now strictly there are only two main notes supplied by Luke which are of use to us here: the one, that the Baptist commenced his work in the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius; the other that Jesus was about thirty years of age when he began to come forward as the Christ.[3] The latter note, however, is left in itself somewhat indefinite, and is, moreover, less precise in Luke's Gospel, inasmuch as he does not state in what year the Baptist or Jesus was born.

If the date of the public appearance of the Baptist is correct (which we have no reason to doubt), this event occurred in the year 781 U.C., or in the year 28 of our present Christian era. But Luke does not say that Jesus entered on his public work as Christ in the same year as the Baptist on his work. We must therefore leave this hiatus for the present as it is. Yet it is in itself probable that Christ's public appearance must be supposed not to have been far distant from this date, since Luke would probably otherwise have added a fresh indication of the year.

But further, we assume here as certain (which will be subsequently seen to be true), that the public work of Jesus lasted at least from three and a half to four years, as must be inferred from the narratives of John. If some Church Fathers

[1] See *ante*, pp. 138 sq. [2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44. [3] Luke iii. 1, 23.

said that the public labours of Jesus were continued three or four years, this statement was at least more correct than that they lasted only one year;[1] for the latter opinion was based merely upon appearances which the present Gospel of Matthew as well as that of Luke might easily give rise to. How groundless the opinion is, will appear as we proceed.

If Luke had also considered it worth the trouble to state precisely in what year Jesus was crucified, we should then be able by means of that date to come to a certain conclusion with regard to the conjectures which John enables us to make as to the duration of his public life. But in the end of his book precisely the same unconcern about such observations recurs which, as we have seen, marks originally the whole Gospel literature—a phenomenon which need create the less surprise, as later, in the Acts of the Apostles also, Luke exhibits the same indifference with regard to any closer connection between the two great divisions of the general history of that time.

One fact, however, in the history of Jesus is mentioned quite similarly by all the Gospels without distinction—that his death fell on a Friday. But this Friday, according to the more exact reminiscences (to be dealt with below), was likewise that day of the year in question on the evening of which the Passover began, or the fourteenth of the spring month of that year. If we could therefore find in that cycle of time likewise a year in which the fourteenth of this month fell, according to the arrangement of the feasts, upon a Friday, we should thereby get a terminal limit for this general history. Now, an ancient opinion states with tolerable unanimity, and, according to all appearance, on the basis of careful calculations, that the death of Jesus occurred in the year 33 of our era and on the fourteenth of

[1] It may be most perfectly seen from Irenæus, *Adv. Hæres.* ii. 22 (38, 39), and Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* i. 10, in what a condition of uncertainty and mere conjecture the Church Fathers found themselves as regards this question of the length of the public life of Jesus. But precisely the most incorrect view, namely, that of a duration of one year, became very early, even from the second century, the prevailing one both amongst the small Christian sects and in the Church generally. The basis of this view was the merely apparent meaning of the words Luke iv. 19, as quoted from Isa. lxi. 2, as if Christ himself had thus supplied the duration of his public life in accordance with the prophecies of the O.T. And not a few saw even in the Passover lamb of a year old (Ex. xii. 5) a further confirmation of that view. The Church Fathers were accordingly uncertain likewise as regards the year of the birth and of the death of Jesus. Still it is in the highest degree noteworthy that *Meliton*, who moreover may be most trusted to have made a closer examination, extended the teaching labours of Christ to three years (see the passage in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesmense*, ii. p. lxi.). Moreover, the best Syriac authors place Christ's death in the eighteenth year of Tiberius—i.e. extend his public work to from three to four years. Comp. Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, p. 167; Hippolytus, in Lagarde's *Anal.* p. 115, 18, places with the Easterns Christ's birth in 310 Seleucid Era. Comp. Epiphanius, *Hær.* lxxviii. 7.

the spring month—namely, at the Passover, towards evening;[1] and in modern times it has been sought to show astronomically that this day was really a Friday.[2] If we now place the year 28 of our era, which we saw above was the time of the commencement of the Baptist's ministry, in conjunction with this year 33 of our era, we get a period of some five years, during the course of which, we can very well suppose, all that is known to us of the public labours of both the Baptist and Jesus really took place. For this period, looked at from a general point of view, is not too brief for the display of the uncommon activity of the Baptist, and the still greater activity of Jesus. However intensely powerful their work was, we can hardly imagine that, under any circumstances, could it have been accomplished in much less time. Further, all the indications and traces of the history of the world at that time, as the other side of the general history of this period, are in harmony with this calculation, as that history is described above[3] and must be further touched upon in some points below.[4] And, finally, those indications in the Gospel of John present from quite another quarter a wholly unlooked-for coincidence with this calculation; and the undesigned manner in which they were written down makes them the more acceptable to us, since they serve to sustain the main proof from quite another quarter.

The Gospel of John presents us, indeed, with quite a different additional piece of evidence for the correctness of the date of the beginning of the period just mentioned. In quoting a speech of the representatives of the Hagiocracy regarding the sanctity of the Temple, which was uttered immediately after Christ's first public appearance, they are made to say that the Temple (so far as it had then been finished) was not built in less than forty-six years.[5] This relates to the building of the Temple of Herod, which, though continued long after his death, was commenced in the year 20 B.C.[6] The year 20 B.C., as but part of a year, not being counted, we get really 46 years down to 28 A.D., the last year again being left out (since in the above passage it is only the complete years of the building of the Temple as far

[1] Against the notion of a ministry of one year, which was very prevalent in his time, and therefore of the crucifixion in the fifteenth or sixteenth year of Tiberius, Eusebius, in the *Chron. Armen.* ii. p. 264, names the eighteenth (according to another reading the nineteenth) year of that Emperor; whilst as an Eastern he adheres to the view of the fourteenth of the month.

[2] See Wurm's *Astronomische Beiträge zur genaueren Bestimmung des Geburts-und Todesjahres Jesu*, in Bengel's *Archiv für Theologie*, vol. ii. pp. 1 sq., 261 sq.

[3] See pp. 61 sq.

[4] This period between 28–33 A.D. is also confirmed by the coins with increasing plainness; see De Saulcy in the *Athen. franc.* 1855, pp. 458, 640.

[5] John ii. 20.

[6] See vol. v. p. 433.

as it was then finished which are reckoned together). Now, whether John really heard at some time these words containing such an accurate note of time, or whether he thus recorded them for the first time in his Gospel, in either case we see that he fixed the time of the first public appearance of Jesus quite in accordance with Luke, and that (if he had considered it a matter of importance) he would have been quite able to assign to the Gospel history in all its main divisions its chronological place in the history of the world. It is only the interval between the public appearance of the Baptist and that of Jesus which seems to be less attended to in these calculations. But probably it was not a long interval, and it appears in the subsequent endeavours to recollect the events to have gradually grown less and less.[1]

With regard, therefore, to the duration of the public work of the Baptist and Jesus, and to a number of important events connected with it, we have in general chronological information of a sufficiently trustworthy character. Though not a few details of the history will probably never be made perfectly clear again in their exact chronological connection, yet many points may once more become certain by means of continued closer inquiry, and much, the certainty of which has been doubted in recent times, will, on the contrary, become plainer again. Moreover, it must never be forgotten that very many of the events of this history generally are not of such a kind that much depends on their exact chronological placing, since it is only as contributions to the fuller knowledge of the life and work of Jesus that they have their primary significance.

On the other hand, the events that lie further back than the period of the public labours of the two men, and especially of Jesus, are chronologically far more difficult to ascertain with the same measure of certainty. In reality, also, so far as this history itself in its higher sense and its lasting import is concerned, it does not signify very much whether we know or not exactly how old Jesus was when he began his public work; and the earlier Gospels still pass over all this completely. It is true that Luke seeks to determine this point also by the addition, that he was then 'about thirty years' old; but this expression is itself far from definite, and has therefore given rise to many mistakes. If the words 'about thirty years' were to be taken,

[1] As (according to pp. 66 *ante*) the building of the Temple in the wider sense was still continued, it is probable that just at that time a more marked stage in this protracted work had been reached, so that exactly 46 years could now be more definitely named. At all events, the words in John favour this view, and we may not overlook this possibility.

in spite of the indefiniteness in which Luke left them, as meaning strictly thirty, and the fifteenth year of Tiberius, or 781–782 U.C., were compared therewith, as the year named by Luke in which the Baptist commenced his work, and also, as might easily be supposed, Jesus commenced his, we should get the year 751–2 U.C. as that of his birth. Or if it was supposed that he commenced his work two or three years later than the Baptist, we should get the year 754 U.C., the calculation which, through the ignorance at the beginning of the Middle Ages in Europe, became the basis of the Christian era still in use. But if Jesus was born under Herod the Great, as the last author of the Gospel of Matthew, and as Luke, quite independently of him, state, this period of thirty years is too short, since Herod died 750 U.C. Indeed, his birth might very well be placed probably one or two years earlier than this, as, according to the sense of the narratives of his nativity, it can hardly be meant that he was born in the very last year of Herod's life.[1]

Now, it is true that the narrative in Luke as to the Roman census during which Jesus is said to have been born, appears likely to supply some more particular information as to the year of his birth. But the year for which Augustus had decreed such a census 'over the whole world,' is neither mentioned in this narrative itself, nor has it hitherto been ascertained from other sources. As a fact this entire narrative, as Luke communicates it, is simply quoted by him, according to plain indications, from an earlier document, and Luke contents himself merely with remarking for his own part, in a brief parenthesis, that this census must not be confounded with the later[2] one under Quirinius.[3] Now, as this narrative, received by

[1] The narratives in Luke determine nothing regarding Herod's age; but those of the star of the Magi, Matt. ii., enable us to gather that probably Jesus was born some two years before Herod's death. For the two years, specified by the Magi, of the shining of the star, are meant obviously not to fix the time too short during which he may have been born, since a star of this kind from the faith in it must surely rise only a few months before the actual birth, and Herod has all boys under two years slain; and after the flight from Bethlehem to Egypt, again, an interval of some length must have occurred before Herod's death. Very general, therefore, as the descriptions of Matt. ii. are meant to be, it is possible to gather from them that Jesus was, by the writer, considered to have been born at least some two years before Herod's death.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 43 sq.

[3] I have on a former occasion shown that the words Luke ii. 2 are merely an inserted remark by Luke's own hand, in which he explains somewhat more particularly the less definite words of the earlier statement. But precisely because he approached his documents as a student of the chronological facts, and as one who was well acquainted with the very dissimilar census under Quirinius, we must understand his words as thus intended to guard against the possible error that the census under Quirinius was meant in the earlier statement. The *πρώτη* before *ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου*, is therefore only the strong comparative (as in Sanskrit similar constructions often occur), and the sense is, 'this census took place much

Luke into his book, throughout describes only in a very general way anything that it touches upon from the outside history of the world, it is manifestly only a remote tradition of such a census of 'the whole world,' under Augustus, while Herod was still living, which lies at the bottom of this part of it. The censuses which Augustus decreed during Herod's life could in any case immediately include only Romans and Roman subjects, not likewise Palestine and the other federate countries. Neither is the census described in Luke as having been taken after the Roman, but by families after the ancient Hebrew manner. But Augustus liked, as was probably well known, to have careful statistics of the population of the entire Empire, including the *Imperii socii*, and had in the year 746 U.C. decreed a Roman census. The Emperor exhibited very early a strong liking for the greatest possible uniformity even in assessments and taxes, and Herod, who was then getting old and increasingly dependent on Augustus, had without doubt shown willingness to help him in this desire to get a more particular account of the population of his country.[1] We know also that in one of the last years before his death Herod compelled the whole people to take a solemn oath of allegiance to himself and the Emperor,[2] which was probably carried out in the case of the men who were assembled for the census. From this incident the more definite idea of a census found in Luke's document could have arisen, and in that case it would not be without an historical foundation; and this supposition is the more probable from the

earlier than when Quirinius became governor'; comp. πρῶτός μου, John i. 15, 30; xv. 18. It is true A. W. Zumpt, in the *Comment. epigraph. ad antiq. rom. pert.*, vol. ii. (1854), pp. 88 sq. (and likewise again in the *Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1865, pp. 969–75), seeks to prove that Quirinius was once really governor of Syria from 4 to 1 B.C., and that as such he subdued the Cilician mountain tribe of Homona, Tac. *Ann.* iii. 48; but if even Cilicia belonged to the Syrian province (which subsequent to the times of the last Seleucidæ is certainly credible), he could still have conducted the war in Cilicia as extraordinary *Legatus Cæsaris in Syria*; and in any case he was, according to the language of Josephus, not governor of Syria until after Herod's death. Luke's words cannot therefore be explained in this way either; and if Luke desired to mention a second census under Quirinius, he must in that case speak plainer in each instance. [Comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.*, i. pp. 232 sq.]

[1] There is the more reason for supposing such an endeavour after uniformity in the Roman arrangements when it is remembered that, according to p. 54, *note*, the Roman system of taxation was in existence under the Tetrarchs even. If Herod was obliged to pay the taxes mentioned above (vol. v. p. 406) to the Romans (which was the case subsequent to the battle of Actium, according to the supposition in Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. 9, 10, 22, sq., which is certainly a very vague one), Augustus had a right to demand the census: yet this at all events is not to be inferred from the accounts of Josephus. The statements in the *Cosmographia Æthici* (Leipzig 1853), xxxii., regarding the census, are not very accurate; and *Marinus*, in Mosis Chor. *Histor. Armen.* ii. 29, is undoubtedly an error for *Quirinius*.

[2] According to the indications of Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. 2, 4, 6,000 Pharisees had at that time refused this oath and had been fined in consequence; comp. vol. v. p. 445.

fact that we were compelled above by other considerations to go back nearly to this year 746 U.C. as that of the birth of Christ.

If, accordingly, we are unable to fix quite definitely the exact year of the birth of Jesus, it nevertheless appears from all the evidence that the expression 'about thirty years' in Luke is to be taken rather to signify that at the time of his entrance on his ministry he was already a few years above thirty. And this is the most probable conclusion that can be arrived at with reference to the divergent opinions which were urged in the early Church.[1]

On the other hand, the month and the day of the birth of Christ is not mentioned, or even generally indicated, either in the Gospels or in other early documents; just as in the Old Testament also no importance is attached to this point in the case of any one of its distinguished men.[2] Moreover, the Christian Church subsequently longed in vain to obtain a faithful portrait of the physical appearance and form of the Lord;[3]

[1] When the Jews, John viii. 5, 7, say to Jesus, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old,' they name such a large and round number simply in contrast with the immeasurably large number of years that had passed since the time of Abraham; it was not their intention to determine the exact number of years that he had lived, and the inference which *Irenæus, Adv. Hær.* ii. 22, draws thence, that Jesus must then have been more than forty years old, is uncertain. Still it remains evident that when he makes the Jews speak thus, John thinks of Jesus as in the last year of his life rather some 35–37 than 30 years old. And in so far this incidental indication also accords tolerably well with the above conclusion from other proofs. When, again, Justin says in his *Apology*, i. 46 (which he wrote subsequent to the year 147 A.D.), that Christ was born 150 years ago, this round number also agrees very well, only that, misled by Luke ii. 2, he erroneously adds *under Quirinius*. The more exact dates in Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. 9 sq., 22 sq., also accord in the end substantially with the above suppositions with regard to the years of Christ's birth and death. With regard to the calculations in the Syriac Church, comp. Cureton's summary remarks in his *Ancient Syriac Monuments*, pp. 146 sq., and the passage in Land's *Anecdota Syriaca*, p. 167.

The book of Karl Ammer, *Chronologie des Lebens Jesu Christi* (Straubing, 1855), is of value only so far as it refutes the views of Sepp; yet their refutation was hardly required. Neither does Hermann Gerlach's work on the *Römische Statthalter in Syrien und Judäa* (Berlin, 1865) essentially aid the settlement of this question.

[2] In accordance with this fact simply a day for celebrating the *Epiphany* of Christ was held in the early Church, and at the time of the new solar year, on January 6; but at the earliest not before the second or third century; see the most recent evidence on this point in De Lagarde's *Reliquiæ juris eccles. antiq.*, Syriac ed. (Leipzig, 1856), p. 35, 10 sq. How easily December 25 could take its place elsewhere appears from vol. v. pp. 311 sq.

[3] With regard to the portrait of Christ at Edessa and Rome, see Nicephorus in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesm.* iv. p. 332. According to Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* vii. 18 (comp. Sozom. v. 20), two great statues, Christ meeting the woman with an issue of blood (see below), were found as early as the third century at Paneas (*ante*, p. 72), but probably ancient heathen statues were only thus interpreted. It is true we do not at present know what was the origin of the portrait of him which Alexander Severus (according to the life of him by Lampridius, ch. 29) received into his Pantheon. Comp. on the whole question, whether we have genuine portraits of Christ, which was so early discussed, Eusebius in Pitra's *Spicil. Solesm.* i. pp. 383, 493.

the brevity and retirement of his appearance on the earth tended to the same result in this respect as the dread felt by the ancient nation of the true religion of artistic representations of great men;[1] and before the minds of the earliest of his followers and disciples, moreover, there was always present, for good reasons, so exclusively the radiant image of his celestial glorification and return that in comparison with it all portraits by human art appeared necessarily to vanish.

The Stages of this Special History.

If we turn from the outward chronological limits of this history of a few brief years to the progressive course and stages of its inner development, we cannot too much admire how all the highest attainments are compressed into such a narrow space, while at the same time they pass through three very different stages previous to their completion and the attainment of a temporary repose. But in this way also the entire vital force and all the long labour of germination, growth, and florification in the case of a noble tree are at last in a brief period gathered up in the miracle of the small compressed fruit, in order that this may yield yet far more abundant seed when it has developed and grown ripe. And in this case, moreover, we have an absolutely unique tree of the noblest kind, and at last fruit which is just ripening after two thousand years—indeed, one may say, after the whole course of past human history.

The perfect Man of God had now to come as the founder of the perfect Kingdom of God and as the Saviour for all the world's sins. It was to this illimitable thought and to this burning desire that the nation itself now rose in consequence of its long life and painful conflict for the true religion; and he must come now, unless this entire life and conflict, with all the severe toils and sufferings involved, were not at last to prove fruitless. There is something absolutely gigantic and immeasurable implied in this thought; even the mere clear conception of, the effective hope, and the longing for such a Consummator who should at last represent and bring in himself the perfection of all true religion with its salvation, must alone wonderfully quicken and animate the mind of a people; and the unwearied expectation of him must impart to it a decided bent towards everything perfect, and an ever-wakeful anticipation. Just as this nation, precisely as the people of Jahveh,[2] had come upon the stage of the world's history with a gigantic thought

[1] See *ante*, pp. 61 sq., 76.

[2] See Vol. II., pp. 148 sq.

and undertaking—that very thought from which really all that was noblest and grandest that had stirred within it during the course of the centuries had sprung—so now, when that thought which had become historical cannot historically develop itself further, this nation ends its career with a much more gigantic thought for the future, which, nevertheless, fully corresponds with that first one, and is called for by it. If it has been shown by the history of fifteen centuries that as yet no perfect people of God exists—indeed, that this nation, just when it must become most perfect in order to maintain its place at all on the earth, sank lowest and continues to sink, then it is that one perfect Man of God must come; and that he may come is now the subject of all the deepest longing and endeavour; and that the nation, in spite of its increasing dissolution and weakness, so firmly expects him is its great merit.

His actual coming is the great height which was in this history yet possible of attainment—the fulfilment of the gigantic prophetic anticipation and desire as far as this could then be immediately fulfilled. And the attainment of the true height, if it is to become actually the rise to and attainment of the perfectly true religion, must be the personal activity and labours of the Messiah himself when he should appear. But in order that this true height might become actually possible and the true Messiah might appear, it needed—inasmuch as he had to proceed after all from this nation—a previous final effort of the whole people for this one object of enabling him to appear; a point the great importance of which has been shown above at length.[1] If, however, the true summit to be attained by the loftiest endeavour possible to the people had been reached by his own appearance and his life-work, this height must of itself point to the attainment of another which extended beyond the individual Messiah into the wide world, and which alone could in so far constitute the proper conclusion of this great general attainment, inasmuch as it is ultimately the consummation not of the individual Messiah but of the kingdom of God in the world at large that is contemplated and which can begin as soon as the Messiah in his perfection exists.

Accordingly that great general height, the attainment of which constitutes the most attractive portion of the end of this general national history, falls again into three special elevations, the first of which forms the condition and cause of the others; while again each is of a wholly special nature, as proceeding from a new and perfectly distinct force. The movements by

[1] Pp. 121 sq.

which these heights are attained unfold themselves with marvellous rapidity, are closely interwoven with each other, and each of them has its own peculiar period, whilst the last brings us to the Apostolic history, and, indeed, to the general history of the world, and as regards its issues is continued in our own day. In Christ they are all connected, and he alone with his earthly labours constitutes the second of the three, as the purest and loftiest of these heights. He is connected with the movement for the attainment of the first, but in such a way that he is simply affected and influenced by it; and he still personally conducts to the movement of the third, but does this so that he suffers rather than acts, and his suffering itself becomes the transition to the very different movement for the attainment of the third height—that movement by which the germ of the Consummation now springs forth quite indestructibly in the wide world, and Christianity, or the immortal side of Israel, has already become an imperishable possession of humanity.

As regards the details of the first of these three lofty movements we now know comparatively least; yet in this, as in every similar instance, that fact cannot constitute a reason for not assigning to it the proper, separate, and worthy position which belongs to it by virtue of its inner significance.

THE FIRST ELEVATION.

The Elevation to be the Messiah (Christ).

JOHN THE BAPTIST.

The Fundamental Thought of the Baptist.

In many respects it is to be lamented that we possess so few ancient and detailed accounts of the Baptist John. For we can here the less refer to the late books of those who thought well, in opposition to Christianity, once more to connect themselves with the name of the Baptist,[1] as those books

[1] The *Mandæans*, called also Sabians (i.e. *dippers*: the name is originally Aramaic, but only became so well known through the Koran), or Christians of John, whose books were first partially published by Norberg, 1816, but were little understood, and who are still found in small groups here and there in Asia. Petermann, in the *Zeitschrift für christliches Leben und christliche Wissenschaft*, 1854, and further, in some of the following numbers, and in his *Reisen*, was the last to speak of them from his own personal inspection on the spot; and lest they should be confounded with another sect bearing a similar name, compare Chwolson's *Die Sabier und der Sabismus* in the *Bulletin de la classe hist. phil. de l'académie imp. de Pétersbourg*, 1852, p. 225, or later in his chief elaborate work on the subject (Petersburg,

are completely barren as regards our historical knowledge of him. In addition to the information in the New Testament, we possess at present only the brief statement of Josephus,[1] which is superficial and unsatisfactory, as was natural in the case of a historian who was so little able to understand anything that breathes a Christian spirit and is at all closely connected with Christianity. The higher glory and the sublime perfection of Christ soon outshone the splendour and fame as well as the entire undertaking and aim of the Baptist; but he was certainly from the first one of the greatest heroes of Israel; his work the most profound and appropriate that could be attempted in these last times; and the entire spiritual awakening and direction of endeavour to which he brought the nation was no less than the first and most indispensable stage towards the one possible salvation. Indeed, it was even the surprising fulfilment of the first of the three above-described conditions of the coming of the Consummation. And therefore the accounts of him in the New Testament, notwithstanding their brevity and detached character, are not only the oldest[2] but also the plainest and most instructive, because they above all were able most correctly to put forward the most original and noblest features of his aims, and those things which were actually continued in Christianity in a perfect form. Whatever is really perfect is able to look back properly and surely to its own correct and true commencement—a ripe, clear manhood to its own blameless youth; it is thus the New Testament looks back upon the Baptist. But it is all the more necessary also that we should correctly discern this first bright dawn of the new rising day, and estimate exactly in his peculiar glory that hero who ventured the first mighty step beyond all that had hitherto been attained, that he might awaken his people in order to bring it actually nearer the longed-for Consummation.

In the oldest sources John is not more particularly designated by even the mention of his descent and family: the surname of the BAPTIST is all that we have in them, as in Josephus, to distinguish him from the innumerable others bearing the name of John (for from the time of John Hyrcanus par-

1856), which I have reviewed in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1856, pp. 1913–44. A complete edition and interpretation of the Mandæan writings is still a want. The earlier disciples of John are treated of in the two following volumes of this *History*, vi. pp. 179, 515; vii. 172 sq. [German].

[1] *Ant.* xviii. 5, 2.

[2] In his first work, the *Jewish War*, Josephus did not speak of the Baptist at all, any more than of Christ.

ticularly[1] this was a very favourite name)—so exceedingly memorable must the *baptizing* have been in his case from the very first. But in the somewhat later and more artistic representation of his entrance into the world, which Luke has received into his Gospel, Zacharias and Elizabeth his parents are named, and the 'city of Judah' as his native place;[2] by which probably the ancient capital and priestly city of Hebron is meant. According to that account his father belonged to one of the twenty-four priestly families whose duty it was, according to ancient custom, to take charge of the immediate service of the Temple,[3] and who was therefore obliged, when his turn came, to go from his city in the country to the Temple. And we have every reason for regarding these reminiscences from the history of the descent of the Baptist as historically trustworthy.[4] John might, therefore, as a priest's son—indeed, as an only son born to his parents late in life, according to Luke's narrative—have grown up and continued to live in the enjoyment of the honours and plenty of ordinary life; but there is once more repeated in his case that stricter view of life and glad sacrifice which, as we many times saw above, is so characteristic of no other priestly body of the ancient world generally as of that which the true religion had formed for itself in this nation subsequent to Moses. Indeed, it is remarkable enough that now, towards the final expiration of this entire history, when whatever is most profound, tenacious, and imperishable in the nation is once more stimulated to make itself felt most powerfully and to put forth its utmost efforts, it is precisely once more a man of priestly birth that from the purest motives of true religion prepares for a new enthusiasm and an awakening which must exceed all that formerly an Aaron, a Samuel, an Ezra, had attempted and attained. But certainly the whole situation of the nation also had now become quite changed during the last two or three centuries; and it required on the part of the man who could hear God's voice speaking in it, something wholly different from what was needed even as late as the time of Ezra.

If we will properly estimate the work of his life, we must carefully attend to the basis upon which it rested, and which we can still discern certainly enough from his words and deeds.

[1] Vol. v. pp. 342 sq.

[2] Luke i. 5, 23, 39, 40.

[3] See *Antiquities*, p. 276.

[4] The more so that Luke evidently knows nothing of the tradition of the violent death of Zacharias in the Temple, which the Proto-evangelium of James, ch. xxiii. xxiv. narrates, described at length in the manner of this book, and on the origin of which I have spoken in my note on Matt. xxiii. 33-39 [*Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 406].

And here we must first of all perceive correctly that he it was of the nation who first pondered more profoundly the Messianic hope, and in consequence remodelled it first into a true question of life or death for the whole nation. But, evidently, nothing urged him to do this so much as a deeper perception of the true wants of the genuine ancient Theocracy as it ought to be in Israel precisely at this time, when the endeavours of the Gaulonite, although checked from without, remained still burning in the affections of the fiery spirits, ready to break out at any favouring moment in the fire of a revolt which must become the final destruction of this entire Theocracy of Israel, as far as this still existed with its exalted ancient possessions and its hopes of a better future. The Gaulonite desired freedom from the heathen yoke under the supremacy of the Sacred Law, supposing that then the Messianic hope would of itself be realised; but he did not understand what were the previous conditions of the realisation of this hope. The Baptist started likewise from the Messianic hope as the one thing remaining to the nation promising a better future; but he perceived what had to be immediately done in connection with it according to the requirements of the true religion, and he was the first man consistent and daring enough actually to do it. And this fundamental thought must urge him to do precisely the opposite of everything that the Gaulonite aimed at. For he was thereby compelled far more than the Gaulonite to make the Messianic hope the foundation of his entire work, and already perceived with perfect clearness that that hope of a unique kind might not in the actual circumstances, when everything pressed to a final decision, be left idle and unproductive in books, or in mere thought, expectation, and imagination, but that it was high time to lay hold, with all sincerity of mind and deed, upon what it involved as an immediate practical requirement from the whole people. Moreover, the Baptist was also resolute, brave, and skilful enough not merely to perceive this correctly, but also to carry it out with regard to himself and the whole nation. In this twofold power of the requisite perception of what his time needed, and of the decisive and persistent action answering thereto, consists his peculiar importance and his lasting service. But that his efforts were of themselves at once so productive and magnificent, and, subsequently, so marvellously influential beyond his own sphere, by virtue of the natural consequences of the movement he had awakened, was far less due to him than to the pure truth and infinite grandeur of the thought of the hope itself; and the marvellous power of

lofty truth elevated a mind which had dared to trust it absolutely, as far as he was capable of being solely animated by it.

It is not right, and least of all right at this time, idly to hope for the coming of the Messiah under all kinds of perverse suppositions and expectations; his coming is to be expected as certain, and never more so than now;[1] but if he is to come for the salvation of Israel, Israel must prepare itself to receive him in the right way. He will come, as every king may, as a strict judge, that he may establish his kingdom with the aid of the right participants, but, at the same time, as an entirely different king from any that has ever yet been on the earth—as the king of the kingdom of the perfected true religion. To the height of this perfected true religion, therefore, let the nation rise, in order that when the Messiah comes he may be able to make use of it as the proper instrument in erecting his kingdom: from the deep-rooted errors, perversities, and corruptions of its whole present life, let the nation resolutely part, and leave behind it all the defects of the entire past, in order that it may simply and alone rise to that new, pure life which the Messiah can approve when he comes, and to which he may attach the powerful connecting links of his happy and beneficent reign. Israel is certainly the nation nearest to him, to which he will come, and which he will judge; but really that which he will seek and that which he will gladden with his salvation is not Israel as a nation and as the ancient sacred Community, but it is simply the consummation of the true religion and its kingdom which he will seek and which he will bring, while he will exalt Israel to his salvation only in so far as it is worthy of this kingdom.[2] Accordingly, ultimately so much does not depend on Israel as an entire nation as upon the individuals in it; every individual must therefore prepare himself for this true kingdom, and, as a totally regenerated man, receptive simply for everything that is pure and good—indeed, as a man who will not start back from the Highest One should He come—look for the mysterious but certain coming of the Lord.

This is undoubtedly the sum and connection of all the primary thoughts and views of John, from which he started and which possessed his soul from the first so powerfully that they determined sufficiently early the entire direction of his life and made him the unique man of his time that he really was.[3]

[1] It is true the words ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Matt. iii. 2, are not found in the parallel passages, Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3; but this is certainly only owing to the same abbreviation which is met with elsewhere - e.g., Acts xiii. 24, xix. 4; comp. i. 5, xi. 16.

[2] Comp. *ante*, pp. 133 sq.

[3] The piece from the Collected Sayings, which is now best preserved Matt. iii.

What he thus endeavoured to effect was something wholly new, namely, this resolute believing aspect towards the certain early coming of the Christ and this strict moral preparation for it—a preparation which is really made a new law of life even in actual practice. And yet really the demand of earnest repentance and a complete conversion to the primitive Divine will, attended by the abandonment of all national pride, was not strictly new. The ancient prophets had already required all this, but the great Anonymous Prophet at the end of the Exile had most eloquently and profoundly exhorted to such a complete new birth of the nation and to the fearless seizure of the perfected true religion;[1] and it was precisely many of his words of lofty inspiration which were manifestly now loudly re-echoed, and which urged the Baptist to his undertaking.[2] But if that great Anonymous Prophet, at the beginning of this last phase of the general history of Israel, was obliged at the same time to encourage a fresh gathering together of the scattered nation, it had now long since been shown that with the recruited and completely developed ancient nation in its new form the Consummation had not arrived; and when that mighty cry which was heard at the beginning of this phase was echoed once more towards its close far more mightily, it assumed at the same time an entirely different direction and proceeded from an urgent truth which could not make itself fully heard in that opening period.

In fact John undertook the truest and most appropriate work that could be undertaken by the purest and profoundest spirits of the nation, and which had to that time not been undertaken in that way. After the times of Isaiah were passed and his promises had died away apparently without result, an indistinct feeling became growingly prevalent that the Messiah could not so easily appear; and after brief intervals of more intense hope this feeling always returned again. Parallel with it there arose, therefore, as has already been shown,[3] the other anticipation, that a great prophet must first return to get ready the way

2–12, supplies on this point the clearest and most vivid reminiscence. If Josephus is determined to see in the Baptist only a teacher of morals, not to find anything Messianic in him, and to make even his baptizing a mere purification of the life, we easily understand (but see further on this below) why he desired thus to misinterpret and weaken his real thought.

[1] See vol. v. pp. 42 sq.

[2] It is therefore quite appropriate that the Collected Sayings, Matt. iii. 3, Luke iii. 4–6, regard the whole appearance of the Baptist as a fulfilment of the words of 'Isa.' xl. 3; yet it could equally well be regarded as a fulfilment of the words, Mal. iii. 1, 23, 24 (A.V. iv. 5, 6), so that both sets of words and passages of the O.T. appear at least closely connected, Mark i. 2, 3.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 127 sq.

for the coming Lord by the preparation of the nation for him —an anticipation than which none could be more suited to the circumstances, and by which the entire series of the Messianic hopes was brought to a close in such a way that they could now rest and wait for their own fulfilment. But was not then the coming of such a prophetic forerunner in this unprophetic age likewise exceedingly difficult? It was felt equally that this prophet must be endowed with the mightiest power to be able worthily to lead the nation, after it had been profoundly transformed, to meet the Messiah; and hence precisely the hope[1] that no less a prophet than Elijah would return to perform the indispensable Messianic preliminary work had been most generally matured. But could not the coming of Elijah also be as idly waited for as that of Christ himself? Could not some faint-hearted interpretation, which yet deemed itself the wisest, of the promise of Malachi even read therein a duty to do absolutely nothing for the promotion of the great cause until Elijah should come bodily from heaven, or from some other place of his concealment, and show that he was none other? However, all this did not fill John with fear even before he became the Baptist; he recognised the Divine call to this age as directed in the first instance to himself, and he followed the call as if he was obliged to do so in the simple fulfilment of his duty. And as towards the end of this long history of Israel, all the highest, purest, and mightiest elements that had ever been at work within it return once more in the most compressed and compact form, and energies that had long since perished are wonderfully renewed,—so this John becomes a prophet in the midst of an age that was wholly unprophetic, but he becomes a prophet of an entirely different type from those whose time was now irrecoverably gone by. He promises with full prophetic confidence the near approach of the Messiah, and requires with full prophetic rigour a life conformable thereto. But as if to attract the arrival of the Messianic age by profoundest personal effort, he substitutes for the entire past life of the community a new one which is alone worthy of the coming Messiah; he seeks to lead the whole nation without exception to the Messiah, and lives with his followers as if he who is hourly expected were already there. Thus did he feel the impulse to fulfil the first of the three conditions of the coming of the Consummation above described; the agonising pain because the Desired One, after such long waiting, had still not

[1] See *ante*, pp. 128 sq.

come, became to him the powerful stimulus of his thought and action; his clear view of the Divine call to his time, and of the extent and the limits of his own lofty duty, led to the wise moderation and calmness of his daring undertaking.

The Carrying out of the Baptist's Thought: his Baptism.

The fundamental thought of the Baptist was absolutely necessary, and might produce vast effects, but to carry it out was attended by immense difficulties. One man was confronted by the whole nation, and sought with this nation to prepare himself for a perfected state of things which he simply surmised and hoped for, but did not plainly see and understand in detail, so that he had never in any way deemed himself able to produce that state by the foundation of a new community. Accordingly, there is once more repeated in the course of this general history, and this time in a most intense form, that convulsive and violent initiation of a work which we have previously seen often occurring at the commencement of great developments, in this case softened and glorified by the fact that that Perfection to which men endeavoured this time, not in vain, to approach, already projected its rays from the dark night, and sought to spread its soft light before its day actually broke.

As, therefore, John was compelled to fully disapprove in its tendency the whole culture of that time, glorious and splendid as it was in many respects, and, still more, to reject all the ruling authorities and influences of the day, he accordingly withdrew from the luxurious world into the deserts and barren places by the Jordan, and in the conduct of his life took Elijah as his model. Like that prophet,[1] he clothed himself in a coarse garment of camel's hair, fastened by a girdle of skin, and ate nothing but such things as the desert easily offered, locusts and wild honey, which he perhaps collected at the time of year when and in the places where they were more abundant, and stored in his hut of corresponding simplicity.[2] It was impossible to begin the new life that strove to be worthy of the constantly expected Messiah in a more earnest and resolute spirit, with the surrender of the whole past world, than John began it. But this life that struggled mightily to meet the Messiah was undoubtedly also

[1] See vol. iv. pp. 64 sq.

[2] Comp. as regards the wild honey, vol. iii. p. 35, for there is no need whatever to suppose any other kind is intended; but it was wholly arbitrary if the Gospel of the Hebrews interpreted it, according to Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 13, as manna, and altered accordingly the reading in conformity with the words of the LXX. Ex. xvi. 31 (Num. xi. 8), inasmuch as by the very general name of 'wild honey' that kind of manna could also be understood.

one of profound sorrow and sighing, which sought, as in other instances, by all the deepest and most intense efforts of the soul, and by frequent prayer, lamentation, and fasting, to excite as it were the pity of God to send the Messiah, and to call it forth like sparks from the hard stones of the present.[1] Thus teaching and thus living, he collected around him a group of more intimate friends and successors, to whom he opened his inmost soul, whom he consecrated as his immediate fellow-soldiers in his mighty undertaking, and who might not shrink from sharing with him all the intense efforts and hardships of sorrow and fasting. He also taught his disciples new prayers, which were long in use amongst them:[2] they undoubtedly expressed most definitely the loftiest height to which he endeavoured to raise his followers.

By his retirement from the luxurious world and his dwelling in the deserts by the Jordan, he appeared to be only an ancient Nazirite or modern Essene:[3] in his frequent prayers and fasts, only a sort of strict Pharisee; and yet how different was he from all such earlier sects in his inmost aims! Accordingly, all those manners of life and characteristics were not sufficient for the proper commencement and the full expression of his true purpose: a completely new sign and symbol had to be created for him, forcible and mighty enough both to actually begin and to plainly represent that tremendous undertaking which he desired to commence primarily in Israel, and, at the same time, easy enough to be employed equally by all members of the nation, as they were all on an equality with regard to this necessary work. Baptism, upon sincere repentance, became to him this instrument and this symbol. Every member of the nation that desired to be at all a member fit for the speedy coming of the Messiah and his salvation, was required most sincerely to confess his sins in the presence of the preacher of repentance, and to promise to lead a new life. He had then to be plunged into the deep waters by the hand of him who had in God's stead heard this sacred promise, whence, having also been especially purified from the pollution of the sins he had profoundly repented of, he must emerge again to that new life

[1] For that John himself also did what is narrated (Mark ii. 18, Matt. ix. 14, Luke v. 33) of his disciples, is so obvious that it scarcely need be expressly said.

[2] Luke xi. 1 has preserved this important item from the oldest Gospel document.

[3] On that account a good deal of a Nazirite character is actually introduced into the higher description of the early life of the Baptist, Luke i. 15; and it appears from Matt. ii. 23 how decidedly this element of Baptistic origin extended into the beginnings of Christianity.* Neither is this surprising acc. vol. v. pp. 370 sq.

* [Comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 214.] Tr.

the meaning and duties of which had already been explained to him. In conclusion, he must receive from him who had just been the instrument and witness of his repentance the promise of the Divine forgiveness and new mercy.[1] The submersion in the depth of the flowing water by the hand of the Baptist became thus the most effective, visible, and sensible symbol of the moral purification and spiritual new birth of this generation, and as it were a pledge that everyone who was thus regenerated was fit for the coming Messianic salvation as long as he remained pure, as he had now vowed to do.

It follows almost as a matter of course that this baptism in its physical aspects was of an incomparably more violent and severe kind than that which gradually arose out of it by adaptation in subsequent times. It is true that this means of purification had from the beginning a much less physically violent and physically lasting character than the ancient rite of circumcision,[2] in the place of which it now almost came, since the important thing was to create a new, purer, and worthier Israel within Israel: still it was certainly intended originally to cause an immediate violent convulsion and agitation of the whole man after the earnest confession of sin which had preceded it. Neither can it be shown, nor is it at all probable, that the rite, as John administered it, was extended to children or women; or that, as he intended it, it could be in any way repeated, whereby it would, in fact, have suffered in its true significance. And it follows likewise, almost as a matter of course, that the rite was in John's case something altogether new, and as perfectly original as the thought itself of which it was the suitable expression and sensible symbol. For, however healing and purifying bathing in the Jordan was in former times considered to be,[3] and highly valued as bathing in certain sacred parts of the Ganges and other *Tírthas* was amongst the Hindoos, who had gradually become better known in the West,[4] still this deep submersion, by the hand of a Confessor, with this strict confession of sin, this vow and this absolution, of which it was meant to be the symbol, and this whole pre-

[1] The words εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Mark i. 4, Luke iii. 3, are not found in Matt., but certainly this time also merely from a later abbreviation; the meaning of the words is quite fitting, and is moreover confirmed by the following words, ver. 5; comp. Matt. iii. 6.

[2] See *Antiquities*, pp. 89 sq.

[3] See vol. iv. p. 86, and *Antiquities*, p. 107; and kindred usages amongst the Essenes, vol. v. p. 373.

[4] How much attention was then paid in the West to the habits of the Hindoos appears also from Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 7; and how ancient the Hindoo use of water for purposes of healing was may be seen, e.g., from the passages in Max Müller's *History of Sanscrit Lit.* pp. 270, 395, 398, and other still more expressive passages in the Rig Veda.

paration for the Messiah, was something which had never before existed, and was the most striking sign of that mighty change of mind which was now about to be effected in Israel more fully than ever before. But it is very probable that the magnificent anticipations and figures of certain prophetic passages in the Old Testament were present to the mind of the daring man, and led him to the choice precisely of this symbol for his undertaking.[1] And certainly he could not choose a more simple and at the same time more expressive symbol of his exceedingly successful effort.

For all historical indications attest that John for a time produced an unusual effect, and made an exceedingly salutary impression upon the whole nation in all its layers, sections, and movements; and we should undoubtedly perceive this much more plainly if we knew more details, particularly of the beginning of his work. The people flocked to him in constantly increasing numbers, from Judæa especially, as well as from Peræa and the districts close at hand, but manifestly also from the more distant Galilee; many a one also from the learned schools of the time was attracted to him. The bold speech and unusual action of the man roused also many effeminate as well as irreclaimable sinners of that time to obey the mighty movement of men's hearts towards him, that they might by an easily uttered confession of sin and an exciting immersion receive the promised new life with its alluring fruits. But the stern man demanded more than an external conversion; he required a total renunciation of every error, though it were the most universal and dearest one, of every vain boast, though it were the most truly national one; and he declared to every class, and, indeed, to every individual with whose state of mind he was more closely acquainted, what he had to do in particular and to leave undone.[2] The more rigorously he thus worked, and the more sternly he castigated the prejudices and injurious movements of the time, the more he necessarily soon frightened above all the proud scholastic people of his time who had such a high idea of their own wisdom—the Pharisees and the Sadducees—from his rude and simple place of labour. Exceedingly few of these schoolmen understood him, and

[1] Such passages are here intended as 'Zech.' xiii. 1; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; also such as Isa. i. 16; but it appears even from the absence of the mention of it, Matt. xxiii. 15, and will be further considered below, that what the later Jews say of a proselyte baptism may have first arisen in post-Christian times.

[2] According to Matt. iii. 7–10, and still more definitely Luke iii. 7–14; for although the words vv. 10–14 of the latter passage are taken from the sixth narrator [see *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 91], their matter is certainly thoroughly historical.

approved for long his undertaking, still fewer submitted to his demand and his baptism.[1] It is also altogether credible, as the Fourth Evangelist briefly states,[2] that the Synedrion at Jerusalem, incited thereto particularly by the Pharisees, did not overlook his undertaking, which was of such a surprising nature, and had already produced great effect, and sent to him, as a priest's son of repute, some specially zealous priests and Levites to try him with captious questions. For this purpose only such priests and Levites had been selected as belonged to the school of the Pharisees. In this school there were always some who inclined more to the side of the Zealots, who had then become somewhat more moderate; and it appears from what we have seen above[3] how little these Pharisees could be favourably disposed towards a man like the Baptist. So they put to him the questions, whether he considered himself to be the Christ or Elijah,[4] or even more generally the prophet like Moses promised in the Pentateuch.[5] But he knew how to skilfully evade their questions, since in reality he undertook what had been attempted by no one in exactly this way, nor even so much as thought of, and did not at all attach importance to being, or seeming to be, a prophet of the old type, still less a great prophet, as accordingly he never performed, or sought to perform, miracles—e.g., never gave signs after the manner of the ancient prophets.[6] He knew that he simply did his duty in the way God required it from his age; that he sought thereby to prepare for the Messiah he had neither formerly at any time denied, since this was the motive and foundation of his entire action, nor did he deny it now even in the presence of his ecclesiastical rulers.[7] Moreover, the Synedrion could not

[1] The words Luke vii. 29, 30 are the more certainly quite historical and borrowed from the Collected Sayings for the reason that the mention of the 'many Pharisees and Sadducees,' Matt. iii. 7, contrary to Luke iii. 7, is plainly only an addition by Matthew; the following words of the Baptist himself, Matt. iii. 7–12, contain nothing at all that refers specially to these two schools, but have, on the contrary, a meaning only as they refer to the people generally; and the account taken from the Collected Sayings—Mark xi. 30–33; Matt. xxi. 25–27; Luke xx. 4–8—accords perfectly with what is mentioned Luke vii. 29, 30.

[2] John i. 19–28. If verse 24 is carefully compared with verse 19, and with the similar case which is accurately described vii. 32, 45, it appears that the meaning can be no other than that the Hagiocratic authorities (or, as John usually calls them, the high priests, as being the rulers) were incited especially by the Pharisees to send the deputation, and therefore selected the deputation from the Pharisees, but in the first instance only priests and Levites could take the son of a priest to task. The correct reading, ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, gives only this meaning. Comp. my *Johanneische Schriften*, vol. i. pp. 135 sq.

[3] *Ante*, p. 163.

[4] See *ante*, pp. 128 sq.

[5] *Ante*, pp. 106 sq.

[6] As is incidentally mentioned John x. 40, 41, quite in accordance with this; and these simple words imply nothing else than this. The same fact is also conveyed by the words Matt. xi. 4–6, as understood by Jesus.

[7] Anything different from this is not

altogether deny the Messiah, nor find fault with a simple preacher of repentance who pointed to him. With respect to this aspect of his work, therefore, he had to be left at liberty; and from all that we know the effect of his work continued to increase in spite of the Synedrion and the scholars of his day.

The extent of his labours soon became too great to be performed by himself alone; already he allowed his more intimate disciples to baptize.[1] And how profound the impression was which he made upon the minds particularly of some of these his more intimate friends and sharers of his views, appears most plainly at his death and in subsequent times, as will be shown more particularly below.

Otherwise, we have at present no further trustworthy information concerning him. It is only a later author[2] who states that he had formed around him a band of exactly thirty disciples. The Talmudists have the less information regarding him, as in their time his school was far less influential than Christianity.[3]

The Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth.

The Meeting of both.

But the chief result of his labours was that which was by man least expected: they called forth, really not without his co-operation, the Messiah; who became, however, a wholly different Messiah from the one he had expected, and yet the only true one. In these facts and antitheses lies the whole of the remaining history which has here to be narrated, as it now unfolds itself from its origin, which has thus far been explained, with perfect logical consistency but in the most unlooked-for and direct antitheses.

implied by the answer of the Baptist, John i. 23; which then recurs again, vv. 26, 27. simply in a more definite shape, as the question the second time is made more pressing. As other details here, it may be simply the pointed way of putting the reply adopted by this Evangelist when the passage, 'Isa.' xl. 3—which could be read in the earlier Gospels as a simple quotation from the Old Testament, in brief explanation of the whole appearance and purpose of the Baptist—is here put directly into the mouth of the Baptist; but it is undeniable that John had really been led particularly by this passage to his public work.

[1] According to John iii. 22–26, iv. 1, and the nature of the case.

[2] Clem. *Hom.* ii. 23. Perhaps this number is fixed merely according to the similar instance in the case of Simon Magus; for in the case of Simon such arbitrary round numbers are intelligible.

[3] The Jews, Origen says, *Contra Cels.* i. 48 *ad fin.*, do not bring John into connection with Jesus, nor his execution with that of Jesus. That was the case no doubt at that time; but we must take care not to draw thence the inference that the Gospel accounts of the meeting of the two men are without foundation.

That is, it is, in the first instance, not to be doubted that the Baptist, if his whole position and mighty effort were really as above described, could feel no personal hesitation nor fear, for any outward reason at least, to suspect that anyone who should meet him with apparently the true qualifications might possibly be the Messiah. For just as he himself had not waited to see whether the ancient Elijah would come forth in the material sense again from his secrecy, but, following the Divine call to his age, did himself what he perceived to be his duty, so also he necessarily conceived as possible a Messiah who would not in the same coarsely literal sense come down in a moment with the clouds from the skies: his more spiritual conception of his own mission involved an equally spiritual conception of the coming of the Messiah. Indeed, the fact that he was prepared to recognise in the right man the Messiah (being according to all historical indications the first to do this), and that he actually perceived this possibility, was one of the best and ripest fruits of his own undertaking. And if in his whole teaching and his strict life he held nothing more firmly than that ultimately it was the predominant power of sin alone which was the guilty cause of the ruin of the nation and the delay of the promised Divine salvation, he could not remain unacquainted with the view and the hope that one in whom he should find no trace of the least power of sin might well be the man whom the Divine purpose had fixed upon for the Messiah, and upon whom at the right moment all the Divine qualifications would descend for the completion of his infinitely exalted work. That is precisely the great and wonderful characteristic of the Baptist, that he was not merely the most sincere man, daring to utter the boldest word and capable of the most difficult undertaking and most prodigious labour, but at the same time a man of devoutest hope and most eager expectation. It was simply the greatness and glory of his hope that could render the burden of his difficult task bearable. Hitherto no one had stood like him in action and in meditation, hope and believing expectation, between two worlds, and raised his head so boldly and with such vast projects into the infinite spaces of the unknown future.[1] Indeed, the aim of his whole work, in its deeper meaning and its best consequences, tended, with the removal of the ancient perversity, insincerity, and confusion, to call forth the purest and noblest spiritual attainments of which Israel was capable, and which could only

[1] Which Christ himself recognises and declares in the most appropriate utterance: Matt. xi. 11.

be realised by the Messiah. And could he have avoided, in the midst of this his most agonising search and most burning hope, suspecting, though provisionally, that the man who came to meet him bearing the marks of being the possible Messiah was really such an one, or even acknowledging him as such an one from whom the completion of his own difficult work was to be expected? Certainly his whole spiritual nature must have joyfully hailed him when he met him! It is true he could only suppose that he saw the Divine characteristic marks of the future Messiah, and accordingly hail him with his inspiring word of hope, leaving it to the future to determine how the whole work of the Messiah foretold in the Scriptures would be carried out by him under the control of God, as he, indeed, felt had been the case with himself on a smaller scale. Properly to discern these characteristic signs and gladly to hail them where they should appear, had really been reserved for him as from God by his entire calling, and was the second, higher, and brighter part of his whole work, in case it should really occur that his prophetic eye should unmistakably meet with such signs in anyone who came to him and whom he became more closely acquainted with. He could not remotely think of going forth purposely to seek for these signs and anxiously endeavour to find them; but where they unequivocally presented themselves to his mind, which was as much fired with hope as it was capable of discerning men and spirits,—in such a case it was his duty not to pass them unnoticed, and his inmost soul impelled him to their recognition. The great point, therefore, really was that he should neither be deceived if his eye fell upon some one unworthy, nor draw back should it fall upon the proper man; and it may serve us as a good augury for the correctness of his eye and the sincerity of his believing discovery, that we nowhere meet with the slightest indication that he wavered between two or more possible Messiahs, and sometimes thought of the one and at other times of the other.

Indeed, it is quite evident (and this is the second thing which is in this preliminary history of essential moment) that until the very midst of his great career of labour he did not know the least of him in whom he soon believed that he had found these signs, and had never been in any way acquainted with him. The oldest Gospels presuppose this as a matter of course; but our present Fourth Evangelist, who had special reason for narrating in this and other respects more accurately and fully whatever concerned the relation of the Baptist and

Jesus to each other,[1] states this plainly enough by the words which he puts in the mouth of the Baptist immediately after the baptism of Jesus, 'I knew him not'—that is, 'I have not commenced my work in Israel because I previously knew him, or that he might come to me according to my desire, *but* I have become baptizer and preacher to Israel in order that he, although unknown to me, yet, by my human instrumentality, but without my intention and purpose, accordingly by a purely Divine provision, might be manifested to Israel as the true future Messiah.[2] And the importance of this, and the certainty that, though the Baptist had in his mind (according to our previous term) the Divine signs of the Messiah, he had not known Jesus personally until the moment of his baptism, the Apostle then insists upon once more by producing a new declaration of the Baptist's which expresses the fact still more plainly and definitely.[3] We must therefore firmly insist on this circumstance as one of greatest significance in the general connection of the history before us, and may not suffer ourselves to be led astray by the narrative, at the opening of Luke's Gospel, concerning a relationship and special friendship between the mothers of the two men and the visit of Mary to Elizabeth. For, however this whole narrative in Luke may have arisen,[4] it must not be permitted to destroy the plain truth of the general history, which we can in this case clearly discern.

Accordingly, the most precise expression of the feelings, prophetic longings, and certain expectations of the Baptist before this moment of his meeting with Jesus, is that which the Fourth Gospel likewise puts into brief and concise but clear words, when it makes the Baptist exclaim from the very beginning of his labours, '*among you standeth One whom ye know not*, the true Messiah, of whom ye do not even know the proper characteristic marks, and much less his proper nature, so that ye may easily wholly mistake him when he appears. He is, nevertheless, unknown of you, already as good as present among you; *he who* (that I may at least briefly describe to you his

[1] See *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. p. 156 [now reprinted in the author's *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 115 sq.].

[2] John i. 31. This is the true sense of these words in the general context of the Gospel, and it is by no means allowable to lessen, or rather destroy, their significance by supposing that the Baptist means to say he had previously known Jesus as a man, but not as the Messiah. This equivocal sense is neither implied in these words nor in the entire history anywhere. And the clearness and unrestricted nature of the meaning of these words is scarcely at all concealed by the previous words (ver. 26), since what the Baptist says (ver. 26) belongs to the time before the baptism of Jesus, and on that account alone may not, therefore, be closely connected with these words, vv. 31, 33.

[3] John i. 32, 33.

[4] See my work on *Die drei ersten Evang.*; pp. 215 sq. (2nd ed.).

true character as I have perceived it) *cometh after me*, although, as was before said, he is already among you, since, though he is not yet visibly among you, but must first come after me, nevertheless he will quite certainly come as in spirit already present among you and only waiting for the moment of his visible manifestation, *whose shoe latchet* when he appears *I am not worthy to unloose*, the true Messiah;'[1] or, in a still shorter and more enigmatical form, '*he that cometh after me existed before me, because he was long before me*'[2]—that is, with still more precise reference to the doctrine of the Logos, according to which the true Messiah existed in his Divine necessity and celestial secrecy from the beginning of the creation, indeed, before it, and much more before all that now live. With such a view of the Messiah, and particularly with such a view of the world in this inwardness and confidence, unmistakable clearness and certainty, the Baptist must really from the beginning have hoped for the speedy coming of the true Messiah, indeed, in his believing mind have beheld him as if he were already present; and in the vast number of truths which the thought of the true Messiah comprehends, with their extreme dissimilarity and apparent contradictions, there is already involved what is for the common understanding the enigmatical element of this brief and precise but still clear expression. But if the Baptist perhaps did not himself express his meaning in quite these same words and brief, extremely concise sentences, there is not the least doubt that the same firm hope, with its essential and necessary meaning, inspired him from the first, and, with the greatest fervour and perfect clearness, determined and guided all his action in such

[1] John i. 26, 27.

[2] John i. 15, 30. That is, the expression, i. 26, 27, belongs, according to its position in the narrative, to the time before the baptism of Jesus; the other two—i. 15, 30—the first by its form (*οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον*), the second by its order in the narrative, to the time after that baptism. But as far as the matter itself is concerned, this is a point of complete indifference; and as regards the matter itself, the two expressions—i. 15, 30—refer simply to what the Baptist had said from the beginning before the baptism of Jesus, and to what had been confirmed by it and subsequently. All three utterances, therefore, are in so far alike that, if that of vv. 26, 27, is, properly most elaborate, it is because the other two really only refer back to it; and if ver. 27, the words, *ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν*, are not found in the best MSS., they are here not repeated for no other reason than that they are naturally implied as regards their meaning in ver. 15 and in *μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε* ver. 26. According to this, the meaning of the words, ver. 27, is also quite certain, and we must take care not to find any reference thus early, in the case of the clause *ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε* to vv. 30, 31. The *πρῶτός μου*, vv. 15, 30 (as in Sanscrit every superlative can be construed like a comparative; only then it always retains its stronger meaning), as meaning *absolutely earlier*, or *much earlier than I*, and thus pointing to an *earlier* which goes back into the very beginning of things, is the best explanation of the previous *ἔμπροσθέν μου*, according to the doctrine of the Logos.

a way as had never before happened in the case of any other member of his nation.

It follows from all this that we have here before us a wholly unexpected meeting of the two men[1] and a genuine prophetic event, which is altogether as immeasurably great and attended by as vast consequences, and became at once as significant for the moment, as was necessarily the case with the meeting of such men in such an age and in such a matter. And the same fact follows from all written reminiscences, both from those which found expression in the earliest and briefest form and from those which were somewhat later and more and more definite in their character.[2]

Every purely Divine truth and force which, entering into the history of mankind, becomes an eternal possession and an inextinguishable motive-fire of the race, can only spring forth at the right moment from its mysterious birthplace and enter in an enduring form into the world by means of the sudden, momentary, and most profound awakening and agitation of the spirit. For if even every deeper truth of mere intellectual knowledge can be emitted from the various materials and fibres that belong to it only by a movement of the mind which profoundly seizes and dashes them together, as by powerful friction and ignition a spark arises, much more is this the case with a truth which is no truth at all for man, if it is not at the same time a motive-force which strengthens and impels him to action: and such is a truth of religion—so that in the end it is rather a power and force than a simple intellectual truth. The various separate elements and primary constituents of such a truth may have long been in existence—indeed, may during many centuries

[1] In a simple predication we can as appropriately select this term, as ἀνήρ is chosen by the Apostle John, i. 30, and by Luke, Acts ii. 22, xvii. 31.

[2] To the latter belongs, in the first place, Matt. iii. 13–17, on account of the addition, vv. 14, 15, and then, still more, John i. 29–34. That is, nothing can be more erroneous than to suppose that the latter passage is not intended to describe the actual event of the baptism of Jesus, as far, that is, as this Evangelist considers it needful to describe it. The words themselves point to nothing else, for the coming of Jesus to the Baptist (ver. 29) cannot be an accidental coming, and can only indicate the well-known coming to him; and if vv. 29–31 represent what the Baptist at once, before the baptism, said of him who was coming to him to be baptised, then vv. 32–34 describe just as clearly what he said after it. That the baptism took place in the interval follows from the words, vv. 32–34, and from the actual course of events as they had long been known and could be read in all the earlier Gospels; so that the Apostle in this case also simply mentions, out of the fulness and higher joy of his knowledge, what seemed to him necessary. But the connection of the whole narrative also leads precisely to the same conclusion; for, after the superhistorical introduction, i. 1–18, with vv. 19–28 begins the narrative of what the Baptist already maintained when he first in spirit certainly beheld the Messiah as already present, whereupon ver. 29 must follow the narrative of the baptism of Jesus.

have been in operation and become more and more living and influential and also increasingly tended to unite together; but it is only the most powerful movement and shock of a moment that first drives them in such a way to and into each other that that wholly new truth and force which seeks to arise from them actually flames forth as sudden fire, and completely fills and kindles that mind, or those minds, which are adapted for it. And if this is everywhere the case, it is most of all so in the present instance, at that moment which becomes the true beginning of the highest consummation of all this long history. This, therefore, is precisely the genuine prophetic element, or the original, creative moment in religion, which now once more appears so powerfully in this history after such a long time of stagnation, as if it sought with one blow and one tremendous stride forwards to overtake and make up for everything that was still possible for it and still wanting in the whole course of this general history. We have here in the Baptist the intensification of the past prophetic element, and, at the same time, the lofty endeavour to reach the highest prophetic attainment which, after that of the great prophets of old, was still possible by the conjunction with the most direct and actual seeking for and calling forth of the Messiah. But as whatever is genuinely prophetic and original always seeks and finds its corresponding form of expression, the same thing meets us here likewise in the highest instance, just as in every other instance of this history which is now rising to its highest elevation.[1]

The Previous History of Jesus.

We have already seen what various endeavours had now been awakened. We have further seen the mighty beginning of the Baptist's work and his action, which called forth everything of the deepest and most mysterious nature yet remaining in Israel, and, indeed, compelled it, as by an irresistible force, to come forth.

Jesus of Nazareth enters now for the first time into this series of movements. Not only the earliest Gospels, the type of which is still reproduced in the present Gospel of Mark, but also the Apostle John himself, at a much later time, do not deem it worth while to narrate anything whatsoever of his earthly

[1] See, on some of these instances, *Jahrbücher der B. W.*, i. pp. 147 sq. [reprinted *Die drei ersten Evang.*, i. pp. 38 sq., 2nd ed.]; and, generally, the remarks made in the earlier volumes of this history on the description of such heights of history, apply here.

existence and life prior to this moment, because his true historical significance in its unparalleled greatness really begins with this moment, and begins with it so clearly and radiantly that whatever lies beyond it in the past is, as it were, eclipsed by this radiance, and is in reality scarcely worth speaking of as soon as the great matter itself upon which everything depends is to be firmly grasped. Indeed, the fact is that everywhere the great historical persons of the Bible are brought before us only in their truly historical significance, and everything that has for this of less importance is touched upon only as by accident. What do we know of the youth of an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, or even (when taken strictly) of a Moses? Nevertheless, there is nothing to hinder or to forbid, either in other instances or in this particular one, our looking back beyond this limit into the previous life and existence of the historical Christ. Curiosity may here be active from the most various motives; and as in the very earliest times of the Christian Church many Gospels soon responded to this desire, so now, even in order to properly understand the infinitely momentous point of time under our consideration, and with it the great phase of this history of the commencing Consummation, we have much more powerful motives for looking back as far as we are able into the mystery of this unparalleled previous history.

Jesus, the son of Joseph, was from Nazareth [1] in Galilee, where his father's family were regarded manifestly as having been long resident, and as good as natives of the place. Joseph was a carpenter, and Jesus was looked upon as willing to follow his father in this occupation.[2] His mother Mary had, besides him, four younger sons and several younger daughters.[3] His brothers, Jacob (James), Jose (as was now often said for Joseph), Judas, and Simon—particularly the eldest, and after him the third—were destined to become eminent. The

[1] According to the expression John i. 46, 47. Comp. vi. 42 and Matt. ii. 23.

[2] According to the correct reading, Mark vi. 3; although Origen, *Contra Cels.* vi. 36, already refused to accept it. Comp. on the other hand the narrative of Justin, *Contra Tryph.* lxxxviii.—Later Jewish legends introduce the name Pantheras for the father and סטדא (probably a corruption of the Greek στρατιώτης) for the mother (or rather, as others narrated, originally for the father likewise); but the origin of these legends has been above mentioned, p. 142. A late attempt to receive this Panther really into the line of the ancestors of Jesus, and, indeed, to connect the two genealogies of Matt. and Luke more closely by means of it, may be seen in a Greek fragment in Tischendorf's *Not. Cod. Sin.* p. 61, and Epiph. *Hær.* lxxviii. 7.

[3] According to Mark vi. 3, and many other reminiscences in the Gospels; for at this time of day it hardly needs a proof that these were own brothers and sisters, since it is everywhere in the Gospels so plain. Yet, Matt. xiii. 55, 56, Judas is placed last, perhaps intentionally, in consequence of more particular inquiry. Comp. also *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, pp. 1163 sq.

father of the family, according to all that we can infer from very various indications, died many years before Jesus came to the Baptist; and the widowed mother was now generally regarded as the head of the house, so that Jesus was also naturally briefly distinguished from others of his name as her son,[1] particularly as the name Jesus [2] was not rare, and that of Joseph very common at that time.

Although the family was regarded as native in the small village of Nazareth, which is not once mentioned in the Old Testament, and the brothers and sisters of Jesus certainly remained settled there as already married,[3] it appears, nevertheless, for certain reasons which are no longer positively known—perhaps because after the death of the father it had no proper supporting head there—to have removed shortly before the baptism of Jesus to *Cana*,[4] which lay somewhat further north. The family appears not long afterwards to have removed to the larger and busy place *Kaphar-nahûm*, on the west shore of the Lake of Galilee, and continued to dwell there during the greater part of the public ministry of Jesus.[5] It removed to Capernaum, according to all indications, because it found there the best friends and relatives.[6] A similar reason may have contributed to the removal to Cana.

[1] The designation, 'the son of Mary,' Mark vi. 3 (comp. Matt. xiii. 55, 56), in so far presents the popular way of speaking of him still more plainly than that of the fourth Gospel above mentioned. It is true that the name Mary also was at that time in very great favour; but in this case the second circumstance above mentioned also led to this designation.

[2] Its interpretation, however, in the higher Christian sense, as it is now referred to in the preliminary history of Jesus, Matt. ii. 21, and again, somewhat less plainly, Luke i. 31–33, ii. 21, could only originate subsequently, when the height of Christian conviction had been attained.

[3] According to the clear indication, Mark vi. 3 (Matt. xiii. 55, 56) comp. with Mark iii. 31, 33 (where, however, the *sisters* must be left out, ver. 32, with the *Cod. Vat.* and other ancient authorities, comp. Matt. xiii. 46–48), and at all events have no place in the original text.

[4] According to the indications, John ii. 1, 11, 12, iv. 46; comp. xxi. 2. The Fourth Evangelist is the only one that mentions at all this Cana, just as he mentions so much else peculiar to himself from this early period of the public work of Jesus; and when he always calls it Cana *of Galilee*, this is hardly intended to distinguish it from the Cana which is reckoned to belong to Asher (acc. Josh. xix. 28), but to distinguish it from a Canâth (vol. ii. p. 294), which is also more briefly called Κανᾶ, situated on the east of the Jordan. For even if the Qana in Asher is that which has been discovered by Robinson, *Bibl. Res.* (2nd ed. 1856) ii. 346, a little south of Tyre, this would then have been reckoned to belong to Galilee if it had Judæan inhabitants. The Cana here intended is now in ruins, with the name *Qânâ el-G'alîl*. De Saulcy (*Voyage*,) ii. pp. 448 sq.) seeks in vain to prove that the somewhat more southern *Kaphar Kenna* is the ancient town. [The Survey of the Palestine Exploration Fund prefers *Kefr Kenna*.] The Syrian translators remarkably enough pronounce the name of the town *Qôṭ'nê*. Comp. Καπαρ κατνει in Ptol. *Geog.* v. 16.

[5] According to the chief passage, John ii. 12 [see the author's interpretation of it in his *Johanneische Schriften*, vol. i. pp. 153 sq.], and many others in the earlier Gospels.

[6] But, as far as we can see, these were rather such friends as Jesus gained when he began his ministry; as will appear below.

If we further inquire as to the kindred of the family, we are able, at all events, to obtain some additional particulars. On the one side, Salome, the mother of the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, was, according to all the evidence we can get, a sister of the mother of Jesus. The early acquaintance of these two Apostles, who subsequently became so famous, with Jesus, and the special preference in the kingdom which this mother supposes she may expect and claim from Christ for her two sons,[1] can be thus most easily explained; and we should be able to conjecture this as probable from the earlier Gospels even. But while the earlier Evangelists rather presuppose as known the relationship between the two sisters, John afterwards mentions it more definitely, although more by way of brief hint than as boasting of the kinship—quite in conformity with his well-known delicate feeling with regard to such matters![2] The father, Zebedee, was a well-to-do fisherman at Bethsaida, on the Lake of Galilee,[3] but appears to have died during the public ministry of Christ; so that the mother could afterwards the more easily accompany her sons everywhere.

On another side the mother of Jesus was, according to certain reminiscences, related to the mother of the Baptist—a point to be considered below. The father of Joseph, on the contrary, as far as we can see, had no relations in Galilee; so that it is the more easily intelligible that his family, according to what has been said above, had no hereditary residence in Galilee.

As the family, accordingly, though it may have removed to Nazareth some thirty years or so before, was not in any case so rooted here, by old hereditary landed property, for instance, that it could not easily remove to some other place, it is on this account not at all improbable in itself that it also previously

[1] Matt. xx. 20, 21. The book of the Collected Sayings, according to this passage of Matt., spoke simply of the 'mother of the sons of Zebedee,' a designation which is retained also Matt. xxvii. 56. That her name was Salome is first mentioned by Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1; and that this Salome is the same woman follows from Matt. xxvii. 56.

[2] John xix. 25. That is, the woman who is here so briefly mentioned simply as 'the sister of his mother' is, of course, not the following Mary, mother of Clopas, simply because it would be something almost unheard of that two sisters, or two brothers, should have the same name. It follows that we can then, according to all indications from other quarters, think only of Salome, who, according to the other Gospels also, was present at the crucifixion and entombment. Of a relationship of John to Jesus through Salome, the Greek interpreters of the N.T. also thought, but under most arbitrary and baseless suppositions: see Hippolytus Thebæus, in Tischendorf's *Anecdota sacra et prof.* p. 23.

[3] His easy circumstances may be inferred from Mark i. 20, and other indications. With regard to Bethsaida, see below.

dwelt in other districts outside Galilee. It is true that the Apostle John, who elsewhere in his Gospel appears to be very well-informed and communicative in such reports about the family and its relations, says nothing about another earlier birthplace of Jesus: to him Jesus is simply a Nazarene and Galilean,[1] as he is everywhere else also thus regarded. Yet this is so far of no importance whatever, as this Evangelist, as was above remarked, generally passes over all that concerns the birth and childhood of Jesus, as comparatively unessential, and as, moreover, sufficiently treated of in the earlier Gospels, and begins the earthly history of Jesus with his baptism. But the two Gospels which in any way bring the history of the earlier years within the range of their treatment agree, notwithstanding the great differences in other respects of their independent narratives, in stating that the parents were at the time of his birth on a journey: according to both he was born in Bethlehem of Judæa, while Herod the Great was still living.[2] According to Matthew, there was connected therewith even a journey into Egypt, and not until after Herod's death did the parents settle in Nazareth, intentionally further from Judæa, because they feared the cruelty of Archelaus, Herod's successor in Judæa. According to Luke, they had before dwelt in Nazareth, and only temporarily, for some outward cause, went to Bethlehem, where Jesus was born. And, in fact, these reminiscences cannot at all be regarded as wholly groundless. For all narratives concerning his early years, as they were committed to writing in these two Gospels, it is true, certainly took their present form somewhat late comparatively, when Mary and most of those who could know more of the details were already dead, and only very scattered recollections of that early period could be

[1] For by his own πατρίς, where, according to John iv. 44, Jesus could not at first find any honour, John did not, it is true, understand Nazareth alone, because this is neither indicated in that connection—vv. 43–46—nor in the Gospel generally, as the place of his earliest public labours. But it is incomparably more erroneous to try to understand that the word means Judæa, which not only contradicts the immediate context—vv. 43–46—but also all the previous part of this Gospel, for the very reason that according to ii. 23 (comp. vv. 11, 12) Jesus really found at once more believers in Jerusalem than in Galilee. Accordingly, Galilee alone can be intended, and the words iv. 44 supply at the same time something which could have been remarked in connection with ii. 13, namely, that another reason why he went to Jerusalem to the feast was to see whether he would find more faith (and honour) there than in Galilee; a supposition which had now been confirmed by experience. The Apostle, therefore, here also only explains more precisely what was already known from the earlier book—Mark vi. 1–4—and undoubtedly not without reference to this book. To this must be added the passage, John vii. 41, 42, to be referred to below. Comp. also *Gött. Gel. Anz.*, 1863, pp. 1592 sq. The word πατρίς could of itself signify simply a *native town* (as Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9, 6), but the context is in this case not in favour of that meaning.

[2] See *ante*, p. 155.

collected. Moreover, it is unmistakably the later and higher Christian mind itself which not only from curiosity gleaned them as they were widely scattered, but also put into them its superior knowledge, and animated them afresh with its creative power; and this again is done very differently in Matthew and Luke in each case—that is, the nature of the advance generally of this more definite development of narratives from the earlier history can be seen much more plainly in Luke than in Matthew, although those which are found in Luke must have arisen wholly without reference to those in Matthew, and therefore cannot be in a literal and mechanical way brought together and blended with the latter. But on that very account, everything that they, notwithstanding, have, in common, has all the greater claim to be regarded as the earlier historical stratum of both. To that earlier stratum belong especially these recollections of a birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, as they appear in the present Gospel of Matthew, shorter and more detached, yet manifestly in a much more simple and original form, as well as more complete as regards the essential matters, than in Luke. Nor does it appear on closer examination that what one only of these two narrators supplies is purely fictitious, but is always ultimately based upon some reminiscence, which at the time when it was sought for more zealously belonged to a distant past and might therefore be already very dim.[1] Only the combination of such scattered reminiscences, and the reanimation of them in the Christian mind was quite new at that time when this tendency was most active, that is, towards the end of the Apostolic age.

Very closely connected with this reminiscence of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, the city of David, is that of his Davidic descent, and without doubt the latter reminiscence must be similarly estimated. It is true we might easily conjecture that the thought itself of a descent of Jesus as the Christ from David, and therefore his birth in Bethlehem, first arose from the wish to find therein a fulfilment of the prophecies of Isaiah and Micah: but this conjecture is in itself wholly futile, and, indeed, baseless, inasmuch as the Christian mind in the Apostolic age, supposing it was known that Jesus was not of Davidic descent,

[1] To this class belongs specially (1) the narrative of the killing of the infants at Bethlehem: though Josephus records nothing of the kind, the *Assumptio Mosis*, ch. vi. (comp. *ante*, p. 60) says of Herod, *Occidet majores natu et juvenes et non parcet*, as a proof that he was also regarded especially as the slayer of young people; and (2) the narrative of the visit of the Magi to Palestine; and we know how strong was the attraction to the West which was then felt by the Chaldæans—i.e., the Wise Men of the East.

could easily have found out another way of reconciling the actual history and Old Testament prophecy.[1] Now, we find in the actual history that Jesus, after he had become widely known and acknowledged, is saluted, by those who perhaps desired in some way to flatter him, as 'the Son of David';[2] and that he himself does not plainly repudiate this designation as improper, but attaches no importance whatever to such a name and fame—on the contrary, desired expressly that in the name 'Messiah' something wholly different and infinitely higher should be acknowledged, in comparison with which all human descent and human fame completely vanish.[3] The less cause have we, therefore, to consider it purely unhistorical, if, notwithstanding his comparative indifference to it, the recollection of his Davidic descent has been very variously intertwined with the narratives of his early years. On the contrary, precisely the diversity of the development of this reminiscence, as we now find it in the two Gospels referred to, points in this case also to a genuine early historical basis. For it cannot on general grounds be doubted that in this late century it was still possible to recognise and distinguish quite well many of the descendants of the Davidic family, notwithstanding the fact that they had long ago[4] lost all external reputation and had partly also probably become unprotected and without fixed dwelling-place. We know how much importance was actually and necessarily attached to accurate genealogies,[5] and least of all could the descendants of the house of David be easily forgotten; and, moreover, we know quite well how little they were forgotten, and that a remnant of faint hope in the minds of some was still connected with them.[6] But it can easily be supposed that to trace through all its stages the Davidic descent in the case of each descendant that lived six hundred years after Zerubbabel was often difficult enough without protracted inquiries; and thus in the case of Luke quite another genealogy of Joseph than that in Matthew has been preserved, that which the latter supplies appearing to be rather only a first essay, while that adopted by Luke seems to be the result

[1] For instance, by regarding Bethlehem, according to Mic. v. 1 [A.V. ver. 2], as the place of the going forth of the Christ on his future return from heaven.

[2] Mark x. 47, 48 (Matt. xx. 31, 32; Luke xviii. 38, 39), Matt. ix. 27, xv. 22; 'Son of David' is used in the accustomed manner simply for the Messiah—Matt. xii. 23, xxi. 9, 15.

[3] Mark xii. 35 sq. with the corresponding words in Matt. and Luke.

[4] According to *ante*, pp. 109 sq.

[5] See vol. i. p. 211 sq.; comp. also Josephus, *Contra Ap.* ii. 7.

[6] See vol. v. pp. 119 sq.; 263, note 3. The best known instance from the century of Christ himself is that of Hillel. See *ante*, p. 19.

of continued closer inquiries.[1] And in addition to this, the idea of the Davidic descent of Jesus is early enough met with beyond these Gospels as an established view, not only in the Book of the Revelation,[2] but also in the writings of Paul.[3] Still the Apostle John, in direct contrast with the author of the Apocalypse, attached so little weight to this as to all other externalities, that he expressly relates that the simple Galilean descent of Jesus, which was generally received during his public ministry, with the exclusion of his Davidic extraction from Bethlehem, became a ground of offence to many.[4]

And certainly he does not appear to have been in any case of purely Davidic descent on the mother's side—for instance, in such a way as the high priest might take a wife only from the tribe of Levi.[5] The accounts in Matthew do not indicate that Mary was of Davidic descent: the contrary is rather implied in them, inasmuch as in the genealogy of the Davidic family from Abraham to Joseph, the father of Jesus, the three alien, or at all events unexpected and peculiar mothers, Thamar, Rahab, and Bathsheba, are so expressly mentioned,[6] as if precedents were intended to be supplied by them for the reception of Mary also into the genealogical line. According to the accounts in Luke, she was, as a relative of the priestly family of the Baptist, rather from the tribe of Levi;[7] and although this relationship itself can have no great significance for the general history,[8] still the mention of it in Luke shows that no hesitation was felt in tracing her derivation to the tribe of Levi. It is true that in several of the Apocryphal Gospels that have been preserved, Mary is described as of the Davidic family, but in other ancient ones her descent is either left undetermined or it is

[1] See my work on *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, pp. 203 sq. (2nd ed.). But it must now be added [as the author has done in the *second* edition of the above work] as a matter of importance that the author of the genealogy in Matt. already found to his hand, as a finished whole, the second also of the three series of fourteen names each, and had therefore simply to form the last series of fourteen. It was undoubtedly the Book of Enoch, which we know from other indications was so much read at that time, that supplied the author with this previous model. See my *Abhandlung über das Alter des B. Henokh* in the *Kieler Monatsschrift*, 1852, pp. 520 sq.

[2] Rev. v. 5; xxii. 16.

[3] Rom. i. 3. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 8; Heb. vii. 14.

[4] John vii. 41, 42. We might be misled by this brief mention of the matter in this Gospel to the conjecture even that the Apostle desired to deny the idea of the descent of Jesus from David, which was current in his time; but he really describes simply the folly of such a question about the earthly descent of Christ giving rise to a division amongst the Jews, as if he deemed an express correction of the one incomplete and partial opinion as not worth the trouble. In this way his manner of narrating, in mentioning historical matters, is often very brief and disconnected, as simply indicating, rather than fully describing, what was otherwise well known.

[5] See *Antiquities*, p. 290.

[6] Matt. i. 3, 5, 6.

[7] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* (2nd ed.), p. 222.

[8] See *ante*, p. 175.

traced back to Levi;[1] and it may be inferred from another book, which was then written, how widespread this view was in the beginning of the second century after Christ.[2] But we are in fact able on closer consideration to trace all this much more definitely. When John so expressly mentions in his Gospel that Christ's under-garment, as had been generally seen during the crucifixion, was seamless—woven, therefore, in one piece[3]—he can mention this as important simply in order to point to Christ's descent from a mother of priestly family, inasmuch as the sons of such mothers appear to have enjoyed the privilege of wearing such a garment. And as the Apostle John was, as it appears,[4] the son of the sister of the mother of Jesus, so in his case also we meet with indications of a kinship with the priestly tribe.[5] If, therefore, anyone in the days of early Christianity had desired to ascribe to Christ the greatest distinction, as men count it, he might have referred to the fact that by his parents the best blood of ancient Israel—that of David and of Levi—had in his case mingled for the production of a being still higher in dignity. But the New Testament nowhere attaches any weight to such things, inasmuch as the proper dignity of Christ far outshines all such external advantages.

As we have seen above,[6] the narratives from both sources agree in a remarkable manner in placing the birth of Jesus in the lifetime of Herod the Great: this supposition also belongs to the constituents of early reminiscence and tradition. But with respect to the first events which befell the child that had been born in Bethlehem, the two sets of traditions forthwith

[1] Comp. Thilo's *Cod. Apocr.* pp. 319, 340, with Augustinus, *Contra Faustum* xxiii. 4. In the *Protev. Jacobi* and in the *Gospel of the Infancy*, preserved in Arabic, her family is left undetermined; and this absence of determination in the more important *Protev. Jacobi* is very notable.

[2] The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*—Test. Sim. ch. vii.; Test. Levi ch. ii. The parents could not be mentioned by name in this book for artistic reasons, but they are plainly enough intended.

[3] John xix. 23; comp. *Antiquities*, p. 278. Though John does not further indicate what is implied by all this, it is certain that he omits all explanation simply because he regards it as quite superfluous.

[4] *Ante*, p. 181.

[5] First, that John was γνωστός to the high priest, xviii. 15, 16, may be thus most easily explained; comp. my *Johanneische Schriften*, i. p. 400. Secondly, the early reminiscence of the Ephesian bishop Polycrates, preserved in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 31, v. 24, that John had been a priest, who wore the πέταλον, the distinctive priest's plate, on his brow, inasmuch as it could be inferred from such passages as Deut. xxxiii. 8, 9, that this distinctive badge of the high priest's (see the *Antiquities*, p. 297) was proper at least as a matter of rank for *all* Levites: hence the same thing was indeed told also of the brother of the Lord, in Epiphan. *Hær.* xxix. 4, and of Mark, who was likewise supposed to be descended from the priestly family. Undoubtedly, such phrases receive in their Christian application at once a much more spiritual meaning; still they cannot be regarded as empty phrases and simple fictions.

[6] *Ante*, p. 155.

begin to differ so much that it is vain to seek perforce to harmonise them. To mention here only a chief feature of these differences—the descriptions in Luke, which are generally of a loftier, celestially transfigured type, permit us, in the case of the families of the Baptist and Jesus and their surroundings, to glance into a region the life of which is so calm and full of heavenly blessedness that we could not get from it the slightest suspicion of the severe persecutions and calamities with which this life also was visited. The narratives in Matthew introduce us, quite on the contrary, into the stormily agitated opening of this life, in connection with which the penetrating sunshine of delivering mercy promises a proportionally brighter day, with a backward glance at this Star from Juda that has now arisen.[1] And evidently much more of an originally historical character has been preserved in these brief but more varied reminiscences in Matthew.

It is, accordingly, certain that these narratives did not receive their present form before the second half of the Apostolic age; that, as regards their purely historical details, they are undoubtedly by no means without foundation, but that they only represent faint and very scattered reminiscences, and that therefore we must not, precisely from the historical point of view, either place too low a value upon them or derive from them anything which is otherwise baseless. The outlook into the dim period before the baptism which is opened to us by Luke's narrative of the boy Jesus in his twelfth year is already less obstructed.[2] The twelfth or thirteenth year of a boy was, according to ancient custom in Israel, the age at which he ceased to be regarded as a child and could first participate in the higher sacred institutions of the nation;[3] we must therefore suppose that Jesus then, for the first time, accompanied his parents, who journeyed every year from Galilee to Jerusalem for the Passover, into the Temple and into the halls of the famous teachers of the Law which were built around it. According to Luke, when Jesus came to this sacred spot he here forgot on this first visit, and this time most of all, his parents and all human affairs, discussed for days together with the

[1] All that can now be known with certainty with regard to the relations of Herod the Great to this history, and all that is connected therewith, has been considered partly above (pp. 90, 153 sq.) and partly in my work, *Die drei ersten Evang.* The view of the relation of the Holy Ghost to Jesus and his parents, which is of importance also in so far as it is met with in both sources, must be referred to later on.

[2] This narrative too, is, according to reliable indications, earlier than those just referred to. See the interpretation of it in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 230 sq.

[3] Comp. on this point, in addition to *Antiquities*, pp. 93 sq., the *Book Zohar*, (Sulzbach, 1664), p. 96.

wisest Masters as their equal, and, indeed, to the astonishment of all present; and replied to his parents, who anxiously sought and at length found him, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?'—but then with childlike obedience he immediately submitted again to the parental will. This narrative enables us, though from afar, yet already very clearly, to take a glance full of expectation into an opening life of an infinite and most exalted nature, which thus early answers perfectly to that which we find immediately realised in the great history of Christ's public life. But it is only a single glance that we can take by means of this narrative into the vestibule of that history; and the New Testament has nothing further to say regarding the whole of this life previous to the baptism in the Jordan. The aftergrowths of the Evangelical literature, which we now call the Apocryphal Gospels, with their narratives concerning the parents of Jesus, and Mary in particular, as well as the history of his birth, childhood, and youth, are too unhistorical to detain us here.[1] Summing up all these considerations, we can say nothing more than that the narratives of the New Testament enable us to cast a glance into the two stages (the childhood and youth) of the life of Jesus preceding his ripe manhood and his contemporaneous baptism in the Jordan and exactly at the beginning of those two stages; that this glance reaches just so far as to make us the more desirous to get more closely acquainted with the following general public history as the unfolding of those first mysterious germs; and further that we are able with certainty to know at least that before the great moment now coming, which was so decisive for his outward history, he was already inwardly the same man that became the Christ, and that he had from the first conceivable commencement of his earthly existence been destined for that mission which will now be evidently shown to all the world. And if in this endeavour, which a few of such narratives venture to make, to open from the earliest conceivable commencement at once an expectant glance into the whole infinite exaltation and unique character of the subsequent life, the human side of the historical reality is somewhat put into the background to make way for the purely Divine idea, those narratives are, as still closely enough breathed upon and animated by the original Christian spirit, too healthy to

[1] A special consideration of these is given at the end of my essays on the origin and nature of the Gospels, *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vi. pp. 51 sq. [now reprinted in the 2nd ed. of *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 135–160]. Here there is scarcely anything further to report from them.

permit them wholly to overlook and leave unmentioned that side. This can be seen particularly in the brief but correct terminations, where such narratives betray an inward inclination to stoop again from their elevation somewhat more to earthly and human features.[1]

There is only one other thing besides from that early period which is certainly known to us, and is in many respects of importance. At that time there was in Jerusalem a learned school[2] for the teachers of the Law, which enjoyed a great reputation, and to have been educated in it was regarded as a special distinction. Now, we know by definite testimony[3] that Jesus never attended this school, nor received there any of the elements of his education. Really the above-mentioned narrative of the boy Jesus in the Temple also receives its most striking illustration if he who subsequently never needed instruction in this learned school could thus early hold the most learned dialogues with its chiefs. But it must be remembered that in Israel all education turned from the earliest times almost exclusively upon the true religion, and the learned school in Jerusalem was unable to limit to any extent, even to the least member of the Community, the freedom of inquiry and teaching which had been sanctioned by that religion. Thus had the fortunate freedom in this respect been preserved for both teachers and learners. But the fact that Jesus did not need for his own personal instruction the learned school of that time shows us only the more plainly what the spirit was which from the very first ruled him.

In fact, Jesus would never have become what he subsequently became in the light of the great public history of his life, if his mind had not from the very first received the Divine designation and power needful for it. Everything purely spiritual is superhistorical, itself the original source and life of all history, and leads us, as we watch it, to a mysterious elevation which we can simply recognise as it is and reverently bow before. We stand here before the highest instance, and likewise the highest proof, of this great fact. When the spiritual, or, indeed,

[1] As, 'the child grew and waxed always stronger in perfect wisdom, and God's favour was upon him,' Luke ii. 40; comp. ver. 52, and similarly i. 80. That this is not accidental appears also from the fact that the Apocryphal Gospels that speak of this period have always quite different terminations.

[2] See *ante*, p. 81.

[3] John vii. 15, only incidentally remarked; but John mentions here only more definitely what we might conjecture as in itself probable from the other Gospels. Subsequently, the same thing occurred in the case of the Twelve (not in Paul's case), Acts iv. 13; for the expressions ἀγράμματοι and ἰδιῶται (أُمِّيّ, said of Mohammed in the Koran) can have no other meaning than this.

the supreme-spiritual, which is the Divine itself, looked at with regard to its origin and issue, enters into the human body, it is subjected to all the necessary limitations and weaknesses of the body; and the knowledge of individual—i.e. earthly things, is as limited in time and space to the individual spirit as is action, so far as it refers to this individual thing and affects what is individual. But in the midst of these limitations and these weaknesses, the individual spirit is able in perception and action to pass through all these limitations and weaknesses, and not only perfectly to rediscover the purely Divine, but also perfectly to retain it and to submit itself most perfectly to its operations, so that the spirit's perception and action, although more or less limited as regards time and place, becomes, as regards both its luminous matter and its beneficence and blessing, the Divine itself; and that which is weak, mortal, and mutable, is glorified in that which is most mighty, immortal, and eternal, just as the latter is glorified in the former as regards the world. And this highest attainment of spirit is either never realised in the world's history, or it is realised perfectly for the first time in one who is qualified for this purpose; but wherever it is actually perfectly realised in an individual, there the perfect, true religion has entered into the history of the world, in order, as a light and radiant model, never again to be lost, since the design and end of all history is that the perfect true religion may arise and reign. Now, the perfect true religion, or the Consummation, was at that time most intensely sought for above everything else in Israel—the soil which had been as no other prepared for it—and was, as something which had grown indispensable, evoked from this soil as by the most mighty spiritual conflict. If, therefore, the spirit qualified for this task was also already actually present, his mode of treating the task proposed, his approach to it, and his way of entering upon it, his whole action, conflict, and suffering for it, must become the process of the realisation of the Consummation itself, and the loftiest life-work could in this case be accomplished that had ever been proposed to an individual spirit inhabiting a perishable human frame.

There is a wonderful charm in the very nature of a mission which is proposed to the spirit as springing from Divine designation and necessity. If the proper agent approaches it, it shows to him its vast difficulty, but, at the same time, the infinite glory of its inviting reward, and thus leaves him no rest until it is accomplished. And the more gigantic the task is, the greater are the conflicts which it imposes, but the higher

also is the eternal reward it brings with it. In this case the highest task had been proposed which could be put before any, even the most capable, mind. It had taken long ago shape in Israel, and waited for the man who should be adequate to its accomplishment; but it made itself felt in a specially urgent and specially powerful manner after the Baptist had brought it forth from the mists of that age and planted it where it shone in celestial brightness. Who brings the Consummation as the true Messiah—as the ancient prophets saw him beforehand with prophetic soul, as all the most believing religious spirits of the centuries expected him, as just now the Baptist most strongly longed for him and called him forth? After the most immediate one of the three above-mentioned preconditions had been realised by the Baptist, who can meet the still more difficult requirements of the other two, which, if they were not present to the Baptist's mind as definitely as they were above described, yet were involved in the very nature of the great task itself? Who has even so much as the courage to enter by thought and action into the meaning and the requirements of this task? It is quite true that the mission itself, with its gigantic power, must in turn exalt and sustain the man who possesses the human courage and the Divine qualification fully to enter into it; but who could foresee the demands of this unattempted work and suppose beforehand that he possessed the incalculable resources which it demanded? Or of whom could this be believingly hoped for?

The Baptism of Jesus.

There was, however, one thing which the Baptist could, in conformity with his character as above described, already know from the Messianic passages of the Old Testament; and that he correctly perceived and believingly held fast this one thing, and, indeed, permitted himself to be correctly led in Divine faith by what he had correctly perceived, constitutes the bridge to the further development of the whole future history. He knew well, as was above said, that only that man who was quite free from sin could become the true Messiah; and if he should in some way observe in anyone coming to his baptism this Divine mark, he was undoubtedly resolved to proclaim to him this Divine designation, and wait for what would come of it. In fact, this consideration and this resolution must have naturally come to him from the nature of his mission as confessor and absolving baptist. For no one else made like him such a

general, keen, and undisguised acquaintance with the immeasurable extent and terrible nature of sin as it was then in Israel; moreover, he undoubtedly, above all men, had mightily wrestled with its power within himself, and could become such a stern preacher of repentance only as he laid the most rigorous demands upon himself. But he had undoubtedly hitherto found no one in whom he did not perceive the power of sin, and whose sins accordingly he could not forgive upon repentance. Now, suppose that at last he should find a man unlike all the rest in this respect? Must he from first to last treat him just like all the rest? Or must not his heart then exult, if he was himself really a godly and believing man in Israel, that he had at last found the longed-for one? and must he not submit himself in faith to him instead of, as his spiritual superior, simply forgiving him his sin? That he should not be easily mistaken in thus judging a man was provided against by the possible circumstantiality which the discourses and appeals before and after the baptism admitted of; for we have, according to all that we have seen, every reason to suppose that he dealt very carefully with everyone that desired to be baptised by him, and passed over nothing in haste.[1]

When Jesus came to the Baptist to be baptised, he followed the best impulse of the time, as that has been above described. Neither was he the first Galilean that came to the Baptist, and tarried for a time with him.[2] And, without doubt, the Baptist had then been long known, since the Galileans, according to an express historical reminiscence,[3] were the last that visited him in large numbers. From the nature of the case the Baptist first discoursed at length with the man that sought to be baptised; by these previous conversations he must have soon perceived that he was speaking with one who was wholly unlike all that had hitherto come to him, and gladly must his heart have said to him, that at last *He* had come for whom he had all along been vainly looking. If the Baptist then said, according to the Fourth Evangelist, with an expression from the Old Testament,[4] '*Behold the Lamb of God which taketh on himself the sin of the world!*' he only said thereby what he in any case really felt in substance and must have acknowledged as true. For whoever, as free himself from the power of sin, comes into the world for its redemption, as was expected of

[1] In so far the representation that the Baptist supposed he had certain marks by which he might discern the Messiah (John i. 33) has quite the stamp of history.

[2] As is also definitely enough indicated, John i. 34 sq.

[3] Mark i. 5; Matt. iii. 5.

[4] Taken from 'Isa.' liii. 7, with a free adaptation.

the Messiah by the Baptist, who was so much occupied with sin and its burden, can do no other than take upon himself the burden of the world's sin; as, indeed, in a slighter degree, everyone who endeavours to keep himself as free as he can from sin and will still help the world, must be prepared to share in the sufferings of its sin. If, in any case, amongst the other Messianic excellences which the Baptist at once recognised in Jesus, not the least was sweetness and gentleness, he might easily be led to this expression, since, at all events, he did not as yet expect in him at once the stern judge alone.[1] Moreover, this sentence was not addressed by the Baptist directly to Jesus himself, but only occasioned by the sight of him, and uttered concerning him to others; and constantly, both before and after his baptism, the simple sight of Jesus already at that time made this impression upon him.[2] When Jesus asked to be baptised by him, he said, according to the present Gospel of Matthew, with words of simple deprecation, 'I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me?' Yet Jesus insisted on his request for baptism, expressly declaring, according to the present Gospel of Matthew, 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness,'—not to avoid anything that God has at any time required from all Israel as its duty, according to the same principle which always guided him subsequently also, as will appear below. This divinely authorised preliminary work of the Baptist was, in fact, the necessary passage to the coming of the Messiah himself; no living member of the Community might hold aloof from it, at all events as regards the higher duty it involved—not even he who might become, but as yet was not, the Messiah.

Accordingly he submitted to be baptised: and as this shock, following a profound confession from the depth of the soul, could produce a powerful effect upon everyone that underwent it, so that his face as he emerged under the hand of the Baptist

[1] In that description, 'Isa.' ch. liii. also, the final victory, with the conquest of the incorrigible, ver. 12, does not follow until much later; the perfectly correct announcement by the Baptist, on an earlier occasion, of the stern correction and punishment by the Messiah, Matt. iii. 11, 12, is therefore not cancelled by this expression, John i. 29, and a real contradiction cannot be found here. It is true the Fourth Evangelist often puts the words of the Baptist in his own peculiar form, reporting less the expression than the thing itself; and we might in this case also consider it comparatively unimportant whether he uttered his feelings precisely in this or some other sentence. But exactly this very peculiar expression, which is repeated by him twice so definitely, vv. 29, 36, may very well be a sentence which the Apostle remembered with sufficient accuracy to have heard from the Baptist; he was, as we know, at that time himself a disciple of the Baptist's (see below).

[2] As is so forcibly indicated by the repetition of the utterance, vv. 29, 36. It is implied by the meaning of the narrative that the sentence is not intended to be addressed directly to Jesus.

naturally presented to his keen practised eye all kinds of indications both of the effect of the whole ceremony upon him, and of the true state of his inward cleansing and renewal, so now also he whose wholly exceptional character the Baptist had previously recognised, must emerge as another man than he was before, and in his unique purity and glory shining forth still more distinctly. The Baptist must in this moment perfectly clearly observe on him that celestial sign for which he had all along looked. And if the baptism was not to remain for him without its effect and consequences, but most powerfully move and purifyingly agitate him under the hand of the Baptist, as was the case with others, this moment must likewise for Jesus himself become one of a total cleansing and regeneration. But in his case the cleansing was simply that in which he also, upon the call and consecration of the Baptist, suddenly felt that as the Messiah he had become quite another man; free from the duties of his past life which now lay quite closed before him, having become purely conscious of his highest divine designation as the new obligation and duty of his life, and dedicating himself to it alone in all pure sincerity. This solemn moment thus became the true natal hour of Christianity; all that was highest in the past ages concentrated itself in this moment for the formation of something new which must become the Consummation itself, and this new thing developed itself from the same moment unalterably and irresistibly, in conformity with its own spirit, in such a way that all the future was involved in it. And in comparison with the significance of this great central fact, it is a matter almost of indifference what the external forms were in which the immeasurable truth, greatness, and exaltation of the moment were then immediately expressed.

As, however, the most spiritual and highest facts always seek and find their most suitable symbols and telling expressions, so in this case precisely the infinite and divine significance of it was very early compressed into a few most living symbols and expressive words, and a brief Evangelical narrative was formed which suffices to bring out clearly and tellingly the highest fact which is here really presented. 'The Holy Spirit in all its fulness and power descended upon him as he emerged from the water, and descended upon him, not merely transiently and variably, but also remained upon him, coming down from heaven visibly as a dove, and as certainly beheld as a dove coming down from heaven can be beheld;' we have here in the most expressive symbol the truest idea of this moment,

as far as the eye also strongly desires to behold the divine whenever it is revealed, and in innocence can behold it. The Holy Spirit, in all its living fulness, must rest upon the Messiah, if the latter is what he ought to be; this had previously been the thought of the Old Testament;[1] but while the Old Testament in its earlier periods could perhaps conceive of the descent of God Himself upon the monstrous Cherub,[2] it is now something quite new that the Holy Spirit is beheld thus descending, but descending, as becomes its refined, delicate nature, only as a small white dove. And thereby was supplied the first expressive symbol under which Christianity cast one of the most urgent truths of its own system of thought productively and clearly into the world.[3] 'And at the same time (since the unmistakable word could still less be wanting) a heavenly voice was heard declaring that he was the Messiah,' likewise in language of the Old Testament;[4] and he whose coming had been long intensely desired and for whom such words of the Old Testament had long waited, was thus divinely called.

What is there in all this which the event itself has not confirmed, and what that is not thus expressed simply in the briefest and most striking manner? Neither can anything be intended, according to the sense of this narrative, that could not really be seen and heard by everyone, as, indeed, from the nature of the case, this as well as every other baptism was perfectly public; and at all events the two men who were here most immediately concerned must, according to the meaning of the narrative, both feel all this. It is true the earliest and simplest narrative, as it has been preserved substantially in all three first Gospels, confines the seeing and hearing to Jesus, but evidently this is due simply to the brevity and simplicity of the style of writing. When the fourth Evangelist, on the other hand, especially mentions that the Baptist saw and heard such things and testified expressly that he had both seen and heard, he thereby simply supplies in so far only what was strictly implied in the nature of the case,[5] for to him who is here everywhere the primary agent, to the Baptist as prophet, the heavens are rent in the most direct sense, that he may be

[1] Isa. xi. 2 comp. with xlii. 1 and similar passages.

[2] See *Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. iv. pp. 27 sq.

[3] It is true that the Spirit of God is already represented in the figure Gen. i. 2 (רחף comp. رفرف), as brooding like a bird upon its nest; and in the Assyrian religion the dove is a well-known sacred bird; however, the early Christian conception had certainly no reference to all this.

[4] Ps. ii. 7, 'Isa.' xlii. 1.

[5] Yet Luke already expresses himself, iii. 21, 22, in his freer way of abbreviation somewhat more generally and indefinitely.

permitted to hear and see what hitherto no one had seen and heard, just as in the Old Testament the heavens can be opened to every true prophet, and to him first of all men.[1]

This is all that we now certainly know with regard to the meeting of Jesus with the Baptist. It might readily be supposed that the particular day and moment of the baptism of Jesus was of comparatively small importance, and that the present narratives in the New Testament had first transferred all the most important proceedings connected with the meeting to this one moment; for it is certainly quite clear that Jesus would not have become the Christ at all without the powerful impulse which the Baptist imparted to his time generally, or without a meeting with him. As a fact, we can infer from the fourth Gospel that the meeting of Jesus with him lasted several days. But there is nowhere any trace of a longer stay of Jesus with him, as of a disciple with a master; and as baptism had then in its early period generally something of an extremely violent and overpowering character about it, the power of the moment might in this case above all others quickly bring to light all that was previously lying hid beneath the deeper soil. The lightning-flash of the Baptist struck nowhere else such a prepared object as in the case of Jesus. And thus we have no reason to regard the substantial facts of the above narratives as really otherwise than they appear.

The End of the Baptist.

When, eleven hundred years previously, the first human monarchy was founded in Israel, a strong desire for it had likewise long before taken possession of the nation; and when at that time there came in Samuel the true prophet that could properly found it, a prophetic eye had likewise quickly deter-

[1] Owing to the great importance of this first true initiatory moment of Christianity, it is not surprising that many hands were early busy in variously adding to or emending the brief words of the primitive narrative. But it is only what the Apostle John reports, in a certain sense by way of supplement, which is well founded; all the other divergencies are arbitrary, or wholly erroneous, changes. This is the case with the reading in Just. *contra Tryph.* lxxxviii., which gives simply the two clauses of Ps. ii. 7 instead of the above celestial utterance composed of the two passages from the Old Testament; with the reading of the Evang. Ebræorum, in Epiph. *Hær.* xxx. 13, which seeks even to place the words Matt. iii. 14, 15, after verse 17, but simply without any sufficiently correct understanding of the whole narrative, and at the same time by seeking to emend the words themselves weakened and debased them; further, with the addition in Just. *contra Tryph.* lxxxviii., according to which, when Jesus was immersed, fire was kindled in the Jordan, as if even on his immersion something of a corresponding divine nature must have happened. But the mention of this fire has been simply taken clumsily from Matt. iii. 11.

mined who was the right man to be king. Thus, unfailing as the lightning's flash is the prophetic eye, and thus necessarily is that which has been long prepared for in the secret operation of all good forces at last determined by a single unfailing glance and the higher agitation of one divine moment. In that early time, also, there shone around the man that had been thus chosen the marks of divine favour and success, and all the auguries of a great future prosperity moved before the first steps of him that was to be king;[1] and then, also, it was the true Theocracy which was simply to flourish afresh as rejuvenated and strengthened by the new monarchy. All this is now repeated after a still longer period of waiting, and a yet profounder longing. At length we have here again a great acknowledged prophet, and there comes a king who had been called forth by him as from a distance; who is then at the happy moment acknowledged and consecrated; and who likewise must first gather together his adherents and establish his kingdom. But this king who emerges from the waters of the sacred Jordan must, after all, found an entirely different kingdom, and with entirely different means, than Samuel formerly expected, first from Saul and then from David. This was known, too, by the Baptist, only he could not know and appreciate it in detail in the same way as He who then himself took it in hand. And precisely because the kingdom of the Consummation, if it became the true one, must at the same time become, and soon became, in its actual realisation, a very different one from that which even the keenest prophetic eye could have foreseen and the most burning desire have longed for, the ways, and therefore the views and hopes also, of the two heroes of the regeneration necessarily divided more and more soon after Jesus also now began to work independently for his mission. Not that the men themselves desired to separate, still less to oppose each other, but the very different position and work which each, and particularly Jesus, had now to take up, led them more and more as time went on further from each other, as must be shown in detail below.

As without the foundation of the true religion in the Old Testament the perfect religion in the New could not arise, so still less could Christianity without the baptism of John. The profoundly earnest, inflexible advance from the great ancient truth to the Consummation, with the strict requirement of sincere repentance and a complete renewal and purification of

[1] See vol. iii. pp. 15 sq

the life, which belonged to the essence of the Baptist's work, which, indeed, constituted that work itself, passed from him into Christianity, and lastingly forms the deepest foundation and the most necessary condition of its existence. In fact, Christianity in its youth lived and moved in the thoughts, language, and symbols of the Baptist; and it is only gradually that it rises with growing independence and necessity above this its basis. The great instrument and symbol of this powerful cleansing and regeneration, baptism, was also transmitted from it to Christianity; and this, although gradually taking an altered form, points back plainly enough to its temporal origin as well as to its indispensable and unchanging condition. Certainly, the Baptist and his work cannot be esteemed too highly; and yet Christianity, which was called forth as by force by him (as far as a man can do this), as it then actually took shape and obtained an imperishable existence, is something quite other and higher than the Baptist's work.

The Baptist lived and laboured, after the moment above described, which we may truly call the highest of his life, long enough to rejoice over, and himself promote, the first progress of the Christianity which he had called into existence; but he also lived long enough to misunderstand its further development (see below). However, his days were numbered; the men in power feared his word and his work, as he had a great reputation amongst the people; and if the Synedrion [1] could not bring any charge against him, very soon another and more powerful enemy supposed that he had cause to fear all kinds of bad things from him.

He did not remain in any one fixed place by the Jordan, but on both banks of the river, according as his mission seemed to require; most of all, probably, by the southern Jordan, but also as far north as Galilee.[2] In addition, he probably selected, as he went about the country, other places for a stay of some time, if they presented to him an abundance of flowing water, which was indispensable;[3] as we learn this

[1] See *ante*, pp. 171 sq.

[2] In what definite locality beyond the Jordan the Bethania mentioned John i. 28; comp. with iii. 26 lay, we do not at present know exactly; but with Origen to substitute for it Bethabarah, known to us from Judg. vii. 24, is not less arbitrary than with him to change the reading in Mark v. 1. It is noteworthy that Mark viii. 22, *Bethania*, is found in many MSS. for Bethsaida; and, according to what has to be mentioned in connection with the history of Lazarus below, it lay considerably north.

[3] Where the Ænon near Salim (John iii. 23—which, according to the Peshito, must be supposed to have been written originally in the best Oriental orthography עין יון—i.e. *fountain of doves*) was situated, appears to be doubtful. If it lay, accord-

now not so much from the earlier Gospels as from occasional remarks in the Gospel of John.[1] He could not permit his labours to be limited by the boundaries of the territories of the various rulers of the time, and it could not be his scrupulous intention to spare these rulers themselves the stern words of his mouth when they appeared necessary. He had accordingly uttered, whether in Judea on this side the Jordan, or in Perea on the other side, which was subject to the Tetrarch Herod Antipas, we do not know on what occasion, but certainly not without just cause, a severe censure on the unlawful, sinful second marriage[2] of this prince, and this free word of his had come to the ears of this ruler. This induced the prince to imprison the stern preacher of repentance who was so gladly listened to by the people generally, and on that account appeared to be dangerous. Probably he was arrested on some occasion as he once more pursued, quite unsuspectingly, his calling somewhere beyond the Jordan. But apprehensive as this prince was in every direction, he was unwilling to put him to death, notwithstanding the repeated urgent requests of his wife,[3] who justly felt herself chiefly condemned. He imprisoned him, on the contrary, in the fortress of Machærus;[4] probably also

ing to the ancient *Onomasticon*, eight Roman miles from Scythopolis, we must suppose it was the *Ainûn* which Robinson (in his *Bibl. Res.*, p. 305, but which is contrary to p. 333) thought he had found south of that town; and in that case we must suppose that Salîm was the present Sâlim to the north-east of Sichem. But, according to John iii. 22–26; iv. 3, 4, it did not lay in Samaria [as the author supposed in his first edition, 1855, p. 166, which Keim still quotes], but in Judea; and the ancients in the *Onomasticon* probably confound the Salêm of Gen. xiv. 18 (which, according to all appearances, was situated in the north-east beyond Jordan), with the Salîm meant Judith iv. 4, while the reading Σαλήμ in John is doubtful. We prefer, therefore, to think of the two places, שלחים ועין (Josh. xv. 32), in the furthest south-east of Judah, the situation of which, it is true, has not yet been completely rediscovered. The first place would, accordingly, be pronounced שַׁלְחִים; and Tristram (*The Land of Israel*, p. 367) found in this district a *Rug'ûm Salâmeh* (i.e.—ruins of Salâme). Comp. also vol. i. p. 307 (vol. iii. p. 187 to be emended accordingly), and the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* x. p. 160. At all events Ænon was *not* situated by the Jordan, since John says that *much water* was found there; and we must be on our guard against connecting, with Wolcott and Robinson (ibid. iii. 280 sq.), the *Baith 'Ainun* with בֵּית עֲנוֹת Josh. xv. 59; in some such way as if עֲנ had to be read.

[1] In this respect, also, John exhibits exactly the same characteristics which distinguish him with regard to points of chronology (see pp. 149 sq.). In the earlier Gospels it was always only the Jordan quite generally which was mentioned; but in that case it would be difficult to comprehend how at least the disciples of the Baptist baptised also elsewhere than in the Jordan; and a superstition with regard to the special virtue of the water of the Jordan cannot be supposed in his case.

[2] See *ante*, p. 77.

[3] With regard to whom, see *ante*, pp. 76 sq.

[4] See *ante*, p. 78. The ruins of this once-famous fortress were discovered by Seetzen [as early as 1807] on the north-eastern shore of the Dead Sea, above the valley of the Zerka; but since his time no other traveller has visited and more particularly described it. See on this fortress Seetzen's *Reisen* (Berlin: 1854). vols. i. and ii., and my remarks on his

visited him there, was astonished at the power of his speech, and was often filled with serious reflections as he listened to him. This state of things must have lasted a considerable time, as we shall see subsequently: while it continued, his disciples were permitted to visit him freely. But at last, as Mark narrates,[1] Herodias nevertheless, by surprise, elicited from the prince the order for his execution. However, amongst the people there were many who saw a divine punishment for the murder of such a righteous man in the unsuccessful war of the Tetrarch with Aretas;[2] and his disciples not only buried with all honour the body which had been outraged by the execution, but also after his death continued his work, as we shall see subsequently.

THE SECOND ELEVATION.

Jesus as Christ.—His General Position.

(1) *As regards his fundamental Thought.*

It follows from the very idea of the Messiah that Jesus, as soon as he began to labour as the Messiah, having been led to do so by the admonition of the Baptist and his own consciousness, was absolutely free to choose his own way to the goal, undisturbed by the special counsels and desires of the Baptist or any other man. In everything which belonged to his own special mission, he had only One above him, whose word and whose gentlest hint, indeed, must be to him a command. This was God Himself, God in all His truth and glory, and especially as He who had imposed upon him precisely this most unique vocation, and sought by him to find the Consummation of His kingdom accomplished. The Baptist himself could not regard the matter otherwise. For there was nowhere a contention with regard to the ultimate object. All the most various divisions in the nation, though the individuals belonging to them

discovery of these ruins in the *Jahrbb. der bibl. Wiss.* vii. p. 118 sq. Robinson did not visit the place on his second journey; neither de Saulcy, even on his second journey in the year 1865, nor anyone else down to the present time [1866]. Comp. the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, p. 1571. On the other hand, Count Burkard (ed. Laurent, p. 53) says: 'Macherus hodie Haylon trans Jordanem *quam et vidi*.' [In the year 1872 Canon Tristram conducted an expedition to the east side of the Dead Sea, and published the results in his work *Discoveries on the East Side of the Dead Sea and the Jordan* (London: 1873), with a description of Machærus, ch. xiv. pp. 253 sq. Tristram appears not to be aware of Seetzen's earlier visit to the fortress].

[1] Mark vi. 14–29.

[2] See *ante*, p. 78; according to Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5. 2. But when Josephus produces as the cause of John's execution simply the general fear of popular tumults on the part of the Tetrarch, we see that he no longer possessed a full recollection of the matter. The narrative in Mark is incomparably more accurate and instructive.

might differ as regards the clearness or vagueness, the boldness or timidity of their way of thinking about it, were agreed in their hope of the speedy coming of a Messiah who would at last lead them to the longed-for prosperity. But as to the way in which this Messiah should attain the goal, even the Baptist himself had no other view than that he would certainly have rejected every way that departed from the strictness of the true religion which any Messiah might propose to take. Still less could the Baptist instruct Jesus as to the way which he had to go. And as the task itself which was here proposed, and the vocation which had now to be obeyed, were absolutely unique in the world's history, so never was the choice of the right way left so perfectly free to a human will as in this case, where the awful goal that glistened in the far distance must either be reached with complete certainty by a wholly untried way, or from the very first could not even be properly attempted.

However, the choice of the right way is again itself conditioned by the clear perception of that which has to be attained: and in this case it was the Kingdom of God in its Consummation. Accordingly, the sole and really decisive point is, what was the idea of this kingdom that moved before the mind of Jesus in firm outline? In fact, the right conception of that kingdom necessarily constituted alone the immovable foundation of the Messiah's work, upon which all proper Messianic action had to be based.

Now the whole life of the discourses and thoughts of Jesus with regard to the perfected kingdom of God centres in the profound unity and certainty of the two propositions, that it is already with himself present on the earth, and that it will come with himself: two propositions which appear at first sight irreconcilable, but both of which he incontestably maintained from the first beginning of his Messianic or public labours, and in the inner unity of which lies the whole great new truth which he brought into the world.

The very first word with which he, in contrast with the simple call to repentance of the Baptist, began as Messiah, was the glad tidings that the kingdom of God is now present, and the time of the simple expectation of it has been fulfilled: that it is now present and in operation with all its beneficent deeds and doctrines as the sure evidences of its actually present existence, and accordingly also with both its rights and its duties: that is, with its undeniable right further to reveal itself in the visible world before men and to advance amongst them, and with the duties which it imposes upon its own members, as

many as already take a living part in it or as are urged by a higher desire to take part in it. Precisely this is the glad tidings (the Gospel with which Jesus as the Messiah appears in the world).[1] It is true he brings the glad message only as an addition to the requirement of the Baptist, and insists the more on all that the Baptist had demanded as regards profound repentance and purification of the entire life the more this alone must prepare for the entrance to the exaltation and joy of the kingdom of God. But when that fundamental condition has been presupposed as naturally implied in the nature of the case, precisely the joyful certainty that the *kingdom of God* which is based upon such a foundation *is already present*, and *faith* in its presence, come into the foreground. And while the Baptist began with and never went beyond his simple rigorous requirement, Christ begins and closes the work of his life with the joyful certainty that that to which the rigorous demand is intended as a preparation and introduction is not the less already actually present. Elevated joy and buoyant courage from the certainty of divine exaltation and divine victory, truly royal assurance and freedom, are thus the starting-point of Christianity, as this is implied in the very name and idea of the Messiah. And the royal triumphant joy continued always to radiate from the brow of the genuine Messiah, although this joy must in the future, as from the very first, always be no other than that which has been preceded by the profound repentance and purification of the Baptist. Nor in the brief earthly career (which was soon greatly beset with trouble and vicissitudes) of the Messiah when he had now appeared, does either this certainty ever cease—that the kingdom of God is henceforth already present, or the pure victorious joy which springs from this faith: it breaks out, as could not otherwise be, precisely at the beginning with the greatest depth and strength,[2] but remains in the later period of this earthly career of Christ always the same,[3] and even amid the last pains of death it is still testified to by him as the most certain truth of his whole life.[4] And if in the earlier form of narration it is explained more according to its first historical outburst, and so in words which though briefly com-

[1] Mark i. 15; expressed much less distinctly Matt. iv. 17; it is true Luke has wholly omitted these words of the Collected Sayings, but received from a later source instead of them, iv. 16–22, a narrative which presents the same things, but still more vividly.

[2] In the parables Matthew xiii. there still prevails just the same view—that the kingdom of God is actually present, although in outward extent it is as yet so limited.

[3] Luke xvii. 20, 21; Matt. xi. 11–15 (Luke xvi. 16), xii. 28.

[4] Before Pilate, John xviii. 33–37; with which his declaration before the High Priest, Matt. xxvi. 63, 64, is in essential agreement.

pressed are of comprehensive eternal significance, in the Gospel of John it is from the very first rather presupposed as naturally implied.[1] But the point which is more significant than all this is, that Jesus does not merely speak thus, but he also at once acts everywhere, where he considers his office and calling require it, as with regal authority and glory, as if this kingdom actually existed from the moment he proclaimed its presence on the earth, as will be further shown below.

But it is equally certain that Jesus speaks not merely of a growth and spread of this kingdom, but also speaks of it in certain passages as if it will really not appear until the future. Such passages become more numerous towards the end of his career, but are also found somewhat early,[2] and undoubtedly say nothing that Jesus must not have perceived from the very beginning of his public labours. For if we look more closely at the meaning of such passages, we find that it is everywhere the kingdom of God in its external glory and consummation which is present to the mind of the speaker, that kingdom of God, therefore, as it had been foreseen and described in the prophetic language of the Old Testament as the ultimate divine consummation of all things, and as it accordingly was accepted as an immovable object of devoutest longing and expectation by the mind of the whole nation; it is therefore the kingdom of God which, according to the ideas of those times, was also substantially the same as the Resurrection, Last Judgment, and Future World.[3] To alter the least part of the spiritual truth of the hope of this kingdom of God could never remotely occur to Jesus: this hope, embracing the very last conceivable issue of things, has its own peculiar necessity and indestructible truth; indeed it is precisely the sacred soil from which it springs, and by which it is connected with the true religion generally, that also forms the basis of all the labours of Jesus. He might more particularly determine the meaning of this hope in the kingdom of God, and discountenance all wrong expectations that might easily be associated with it, but the essential hope itself he could not alter; indeed, he must

[1] Neither is the term 'kingdom of God,' or, more briefly, 'my kingdom,' in the mouth of Jesus or otherwise, very much used by John, precisely for the reason that he presupposes the matter as too naturally implied to need special mention; but when he does occasionally use either of the terms, iii. 3, 5, xviii. 36, this kingdom is supposed to be already in existence. Apart, therefore, from the latter passage in which the trial of Jesus is narrated, the name occurs in John only in the first long discourse of Jesus; a feature of this Gospel by which it again approximates to the others in such a way that we perceive here also that it really seeks to start from the same fundamental basis as they.

[2] To mention only Matt. vii. 21, viii. 11.

[3] See *ante*, p. 112.

consider it sacred, as one of the bases of all true religion, and must invest it, as well as all other elements of true religion, with a new sanctity. It is needful also particularly to acknowledge a fixed bound, or, as it were, a mighty wall of separation, that divides the kingdom of God, in this sense of the eternal consummation of all human and divine things, from the present, since in the present everything, even the highest spiritual endeavour and labour, is, as regards its goal, still too unfinished to permit it to conduct directly to the last conceivable consummation. And as Jesus never overlooked this wall of separation,[1] so he also always clearly maintained the inward distinction that must be made between the nature of this last conceivable consummation and the nature of the whole present development;[2] since the eternal consummation of all human and divine things that are now in the process of being, when once it has been conceived as certain, is not conceivable without the formation of wholly different states and conditions, just as the condition of terrestrial things must have been entirely different prior to the creation of man.

The kingdom of God, therefore, as Jesus conceived it, must be both already present and at the same time future: an apparent contradiction, and yet the highest truth that can be conceived, and the highest benefaction in human history if it is carried out. For if the kingdom of God is at all a proper object of thought and faith, it must consist in the actual presence and life of true religion, or in a human life in which God so completely rules that man even, with his own will and perception, and accordingly with personal joy and enthusiasm, takes part in the divine operation, and man will not work and rule for and by himself, but seeks simply to work with God and leave God to rule. If this is to be conceived as properly constituting the kingdom of God, it is true that, with such a conception of it, very much will depend upon what is specially regarded as the divine will to which man has to submit himself, and what is meant in particular by the general relation of the co-operation of God and man. However, as in the case of all divine things, the essential matter cannot here depend on mere locality and temporal limitations, but even in the smallest space, and at any time, the kingdom of God can be realised wherever and whenever man, with his whole soul and all his thought and action, responds to the eternally unchanging divine operation and rule as he ought; and the

[1] Matt. xxiv. 30, 36 sq. [2] Matt. xxii. 30 sq.

kingdom of God will be present everywhere where true religion is operative. But if it is this, it is in itself only a possession which God has from the very first designed for man, but which can never become for him an actual possession unless he lays hold of it; and it is also a possession which is the *summum bonum* for man himself, though, as being a possession dependent on the form and operation of true religion amongst men, it can be conceived of very variously by men, and very variously striven after according to the changing forms of religion. It follows, moreover, readily from the nature of the case, if true religion is for all men alike, and every human kingdom can become progressively perfect and permanent by it alone, that the kingdom of God, though it is possible within the narrowest space, and, indeed, can never spread abroad at all without first becoming settled and naturalised in it, finds its final destination and consummation only in wide universal relations, and that no kingdom of God is the perfect, true one which cannot, indeed which is not compelled, to realise itself perfectly as well in the widest as it had done in the smallest space. So that the best sign of the true, and ultimately of the perfect kingdom of God, is that it first manifest itself in the smaller sphere actually with such truth, and by-and-by with such perfection, that it is impossible either to witness or to conceive anything more appropriate.

In this sense the kingdom of God, as far as it could appear in the ancient world amongst any entire nation, had actually once existed in Israel, and in it alone, as a present fact, inasmuch as this nation, and it alone, had formerly, in such an early time, once vowed to live for the true religion solely, and had possessed the courage to make this alone, at least by law, the soul of its national endeavours;[1] and this circumstance that the idea of the kingdom of God was then at all properly presented merely, was a fact of infinite significance. But just as the religion which had become law in that primitive age for the Community of Israel, although the true, was not the perfected, religion, so its full realisation—the kingdom of God—as it had thus been once established in the nation, necessarily seemed more and more to break up and vanish from actual life, in proportion as the defects of this religion made themselves felt and were never truly overcome, notwithstanding the numerous attempts at reformation. Accordingly the kingdom of God, not merely the ancient one as it had been, but the perfect one,

[1] See vol. ii. pp. 145 sq.

the necessity of which was more and more recognised, became the object of the vast hope and often of the burning desire of Israel. And if in the course of the last ten centuries the kingdom of God, which in its first visible glory had, as it were, vanished, seemed at times, when the condition of the age was specially favourable, to be completely restored again, or, at all events, to be capable of restoration,[1] it had, nevertheless, never so returned that the longing for the perfected kingdom had then been satisfied. But if even the great prophets in the former Jerusalem saw the ancient, imperfect kingdom of God of their time so variously violated, and almost, as it were, annihilated, and found the perfected kingdom for which they longed possible in the future alone, in the second Jerusalem the Hagiocracy, as it was now fully developed, had simply aided in thrusting into a more and more distant future the conception of the kingdom of God, however glorious and perfect that kingdom was, as now conceived of and hoped for after the old defects had been felt. And however greatly the Baptist, on the other hand, strove to bring the thought of it quite near, and make it a living reality, yet even he had conceived its very entrance only as purely future, and something which would immediately surprise men with great external effects, although it was connected with the special capability of a living man. Like the mournful present and the desired future of the Consummation, so the two worlds were placed in the mind of the Baptist too far apart; so that, though he believed that he had at length probably found the living man by whom, as far as his worthiness was concerned, the kingdom of God could come from the *other* world, he nevertheless did not comprehend how this could take place without great changes and consequences occurring immediately in the *present* world.[2]

Jesus was the first who perceived that the kingdom of God, like every spiritual possession, can always be to man both present and future, according as man himself conducts himself with regard to it; that therefore the most perfect kingdom of God that is possible or conceivable, is already actually present, if it is but really operative in the narrowest space on this earth; and that this very perfect kingdom, on the other hand, can never come and spread until it is already present and perfectly operative at least in the narrowest space, inasmuch as, if it is really the perfect kingdom, it must, by virtue of its

[1] This point has often been referred to in the three preceding volumes of this work, whenever the history brought it out.

[2] See the discussion of Matt. xi. 2–19 below.

native glory and power, then of itself extend further and attain its final destination.[1] This is the original fundamental thought of Jesus, which includes everything else: similar thoughts link themselves to it.

The perfected kingdom of God can, therefore, never really come except at first in the smallest sphere; but even a single soul acting in a weak human body is all that is required as this narrowest sphere. If there is on the earth but *one* in whose life perfect true religion displays its full effects, in him is there already this highest conceivable co-operation of the divine and the human spirit. In that case God has at least one upon the earth who is wholly His, over whom He fully reigns, and who in all things simply follows His voice; and a perfect co-operation of man and God then becomes an actual fact, which is the complete commencement of any true, and, moreover, perfect kingdom of God. Not until this commencement exists somewhere indestructibly and in full operation as a living fact can the outward consummation of the perfect kingdom of God also follow; and it will certainly come when, under the constant progress of that operation, its time is fulfilled.

If the perfect kingdom of God can come only by one who has first most perfectly fulfilled all his human duties, and if by his labours, as responding perfectly to the divine operation, the operation of this kingdom of God is also called into existence on the earth, then the ancient sacred hope of Israel in the Messiah naturally also implies in it the significance that the Messiah must before all things be this son of God who thus co-operates with God, since the Messiah would never come, indeed, in his glory even, or in the external consummation of the perfect kingdom of God, if he did not first perform what could alone conduct to that consummation. Indeed, if the Messiah is the infinitely exalted one whose work is absolutely perfect, as the men of old expected him, it can even be justly said that he must either accomplish precisely this highest work that can be performed by any man, and which must first be performed by some one, if the hope of the final salvation and the consummation of the kingdom is not to be vain, or he can never come as the true Messiah, and all the hope of the noblest and purest prophets has been futile.

[1] The utterance Luke xvii. 20, 21, in its true meaning, is in this respect only one of the briefest and most telling: but really Jesus begins even his first public labours with it, Mark i. 15; and can then somewhat later all the more certainly say that the kingdom of God, although come to men, as it were unnoticed, is nevertheless unmistakably enough present, Matt. xii. 28, John iii. 1–22.

All this is implied, strictly considered, even in the internal and external, or the historical, idea of the Messiah. The Messiah is the king of Israel, or of the Community of the true religion, as that king must be when this Community is perfect. In every ordinary kingdom even, the king is, by his position itself, called upon to lead a perfectly exalted life: but this same exalted life, in order that man may exhibit it as king in governing, must substantially first exist in the king before all others, especially in the case of the first founder of the kingdom. If this is rarely found to be the case in heathendom on account of the generally lower condition of heathen rulers;[1] and if the ancient kings of Israel also, although most powerfully summoned to it by the law of their religion and their Community, remained behind their vocation,[2] at last this same vocation to exhibit in human life the purest exaltation of the divine life is most strongly imposed upon the king of the future perfected religion who is expected by the Old Testament; and if he must first found the kingdom of this religion, he can only do this by possessing first before all others in the most perfect manner this pure exaltation.

But if that Messiah whom the best and deepest desire of the ancient people of God calls forth, becomes in this sense that king of a singular and exceptional kind, who by his own life and most perfect regal labours teaches the truth, that with him the kingdom of God is already actually present, the above apparent contradiction that this kingdom is both present and future, already perfected and still imperfect, is also thereby of itself removed; for in that case the one true beginning of the perfected kingdom, and the one beginning that alone answers to the divine intention, is actually supplied, in the living sphere of which alone lies also all its further external completion and even its last conceivable end. It certainly was realised in the mind of Jesus from the very first, therefore, that there was here no contradiction: it is, however, only John who in the very first discourses of Jesus at once presents the complete reconciliation of the apparent contradictions, and describes with marvellous clearness how life, resurrection, and that whole consummation the outward realisation of which takes place only at the end of time, is now already in present operation.[3]

[1] We see from his words Matt. xvii. 25 sq., and especially xx. 25 sq., Luke xxii. 25 sq., as well as from his whole life, the pointed contrast which Christ drew between all past kings and rulers and the Messiah, and therefore between their kingdom and his.

[2] See, further, vol. iii. pp. 6 sq.

[3] John iii. 13–21, v. 19–29.

But if he firmly held the truth, that the perfected kingdom of God can come only thereby, that first some one must act wholly in its sense and spirit and become thus the leader of all others to it, he must likewise just as clearly perceive—indeed (if the order of time is in this matter to be observed), must previously have quite correctly perceived—*what* this action in the perfected kingdom of God must be, both in the case of everyone belonging to it, and especially of the leader and king in it who had been so long desired by all the good. And it was just here that all the highest lessons of all the previous history of the people of God, and, indeed (we may say), of the human race, were so compressed and gathered into a focus, that for a pure, keen eye it was not difficult to perceive therefrom what was the one new thing required, at all events as divinely desired and necessary. All the search of the ancient world generally after the true God and the true divine-human conduct, had at last concentrated itself in the history of the 'people of God' as in its most living and strongest centre: whatever the long past history of this people had hitherto taught in the form of eternal truths plainly enough for every more earnest mind, was in so far equally significant for all mankind. Now, of the three great phases or epochs of this history generally, the last had already taught plainly enough in its course thus far that the true religion may not be shut up within sacred Scriptures, nor ruled by the opinions and traditions of learned schools and domineering parties. The middle phase had shown that the defect of violence which still adhered to the ancient religion from the very commencement, was never more injurious than precisely in the case of kings and other rulers. The first period had shown that the true religion must remain unchanged and the same under every form that the external kingdom might assume. If all these truths, which could be emphatically enough taught by the trying course of the many past centuries, were at last concentrated in one plain enduring idea, it would be that only that religion can be the perfectly true one which retains its truth under all the varying forms of the outward kingdom and the nation, which overcomes all evil by the power of pure divine love alone, and which, without sacrificing its established ancient truths, nevertheless is eternally rejuvenescent and endlessly progressive with every new age. If we bear in mind, in addition, that the other defects which had got attached to this religion in the course of these many centuries had after all become attached to it principally through the weaknesses of the times, while the defect of

violence, as adhering to it from the very commencement, was the most difficult, and yet in the end the most necessary to remove, we may also put the matter thus—that the perfect true religion had now to be established, upon the basis of the perfect knowledge of God and of man, by means of the infinite power of divine love in man alone without any use of violence, that that knowledge must be its eye and this love its heart. And if in the case of the work of a king the fairest thing is the sway of a care and love that without distinction regards and heals all the hurts of the kingdom and never grows weary, and that his rule is beneficent more through the exaltation of his graciousness and mercy than through violence and punishment, so even in the expectation of a king as the Consummator of the ancient kingdom of God, the noblest feature might be precisely the divine charge to bring about the desired consummation by such a course of labour alone in which every step should be a sign of truly regal graciousness and mercy, and every act should flow alone as from the infinite divine love stooping down to men. It is the privilege of such regal exaltation to be able to show larger measures of healing love and self-sacrificing kindness, and to feel less inclination to all forms of perverse and base action; and in so far all life in the perfect true religion ought to be constantly truly kinglike.

Thus everything concurred in this case; and if it then needed on the part of the truly enlightened man only one clear glance and healthy feeling to recognise all this in its divinely ordered necessity, it was still precisely Jesus alone that recognised it, and thereby laid the one true foundation for his work as the Christ. We see here in brief the entire connection of the original fundamental thoughts, as they must have been present closely interwoven in the mind of Christ from the first moment of his public labours, and from which alone his whole manner of working is explained.

(2) *As regards his Labours.*

For these labours of Jesus generally, as they now make their appearance in the bright light of history, are nothing else than the labours of the prince of the perfect religion itself, subjectively the wonderful power of this religion when it alone inspires the worker absolutely, objectively its brightest manifestation in its eternal operation upon mankind. The true religion had been long enough operative in this nation, had produced great results of an imperishable nature, but with a view

to its own perfection, as soon as it felt the necessity of it, had put forth ever higher requirements. So now it called forth one who received fully into his heart and life its entire nature and meaning, even that portion of them which had hitherto never been fulfilled, and who met also those of its highest requirements which had hitherto been scarcely surmised. There now appeared in the actual world of men the man whose whole life became simply the realisation and brightest illustration of the true religion in the highest power and perfection which was possible or conceivable. That which had thus taken entire possession of him was the infinite significance and power, on the one hand, of the perfect true religion itself, as this was put before him as a clear requirement by the past history of Israel, and on the other hand, of the command from heaven, implied in the Messianic consciousness, to become the leader and deliverer desired by God. And thus accordingly he became spontaneously the leader of all men to the same true religion made more perfect than till now it had ever been, and the king of its kingdom that had now to be founded, through the coincidence of this twofold power—the power that flowed to him in all his action from the perfect true religion, and the power of the consciousness of having been appointed by God to be the initiator and leader of the perfected kingdom of God on the earth.

It is true that we have here arrived at that which is unfathomable in Christ, and can never be fully grasped by any description. Who can determine the inward power under which he acted, measure the inexhaustible spring of his spirit whereby he became the highest that was here expected and actually accomplished all that could really come, in the most wonderful way surpassing all earlier anticipations! If we say that he accomplished what he accomplished as the Son of God, or as the Logos, we express thereby something that is quite correct with reference to the meaning and duty of that religion in which we must regard him as living, something that of itself suffices as long as we simply desire to live in the perfect true religion which was brought by him and dates back to him, and something that completely sufficed for the first Christians at a time when the force of these brief terms was still new, and the whole light of this history, apart from them, still shone brightly enough (as we shall see below); but for the more accurate realisation and reproduction of the whole history of his life, as this has now become indispensable to us for innumerable reasons, such brief terms are no longer

adequate. Moreover, the Bible itself by no means merely repeats on all occasions those current terms, but calls upon us by much that it contains or suggests to consider further this divine mystery. The inward power of the spirit which is here in Jesus becoming operative, is certainly not capable of being so determined that its limits could be accurately fixed; and the perfectly general clause in John's Gospel, '"*not by measure does God give* (if He once gives it) *the spirit*,"[1] as if He were envious (as the heathen supposed their gods were), but fully, completely, unweakened, inasmuch as the Spirit is ultimately only one, God, therefore, can give to the individual the largest measure thereof of which he is in his individuality capable,' is said with special reference to Christ alone. But nevertheless the Bible presupposes everywhere, which experience also teaches, that Christ could appear and labour only in this nation and Community of God, because in it only had everything been prepared for him, and its history only, as it were, called him forth. And likewise the Bible supposes as certain that he only came when it was the right time for his coming.[2] But if we examine somewhat more particularly the meaning of this expression, we shall see that it was of comparatively little importance whether Jesus appeared as the Messiah a few years later or earlier; for such insignificant differences disappear, as we look upon the matter, in comparison with the supreme importance of the event itself; although certainly the inner connection of the events is such that the Baptist, as we have seen above, necessarily supplied the final preparation. However, if we look strictly at the movement of the great forces of this long general history, in which also the Baptist and Jesus have their place and order, we must perceive that ultimately, in the case of Jesus, the immeasurable effect of two forces concurred with his coming. The demands of the perfect true religion had at that time become gradually more complete and urgently clear through the whole development of the people of God during more than fifteen centuries; and what mighty voices declaring them resounded at this time from the sacred Scriptures! Moreover, this religion possesses, like every spiritual thing, a power of its own, wherever it really reaches full life; a power which can then take possession of everything that falls within its sphere of influence, and which can overcome everything that resists it. Whoever, therefore, at last,

[1] 1 John iii. 34.

[2] Besides Mark i. 15, see Gal. iv. 4, Eph. i. 9, 10, passages the more complete meaning of which can only be pointed out subsequently.

once permitted it absolutely to operate in and through him, and did not shrink from its most difficult requirements, in him it necessarily manifested its full power and caused him to accomplish what hitherto no one had ever in all past times effected and attained. If now this power was of itself boundless in its sphere, from quite another quarter came further that power which is involved in the consciousness of being the man who was destined, according to the ancient sacred anticipations and hope of Israel, to become the king of the perfected true kingdom of God. For this consciousness imposed again the very special duty of being at the same time by means of the perfect true religion the leader of all men to it and its kingdom, and supplied also an exaltation and joyousness of spirit which lightened even the hardest parts of this duty and sweetened the most bitter cup. These are precisely the two great forces which had secretly been developed in Israel by all its past history, and waited in it, as if in secret, to see whether they could somewhere be united in a spirit that was equal to their requirements, and thus in combination complete their work—the force of the plain truths and claims of the true religion that must become perfect, and the force of the actual foundation of the perfected kingdom of God as called for by inspired anticipation and hope. In this nation both forces had been developed, the first by the backward glance at the plain past and its teachings, the second by the forward glance at the future as the necessary consummator of what was yet imperfect; both already foreseeing their union in the image of the Messiah as the man who must unite the lasting possessions of all the past with the still higher and even more durable possessions of the consummation of what had been begun. If, therefore, both now actually met together in perfect unity and mutual combination in the mind of Jesus, there could proceed thence that new infinite force which was necessary for his work. And if the task, as it could be proposed in this nation alone in consequence of its unique history of two thousand years, was gigantic, it was nevertheless possible; and the greater the possible task, the greater its possible accomplishment. But if we by no means intend thereby to measure the inward greatness and incomparable glory of this spirit, since that goes back into the secrets of all spiritual realities and of God Himself, we are still the more able to see that his spirit must become in history the only one of its kind; and the important thing at this point is simply that we may be able the more accurately to trace what he actually accomplished. For in the presence of

the actual fact and that which this required, those mere exalted conceptions and names, Son of God, Word of God, and the like, which had already been supplied, immediately vanish again.

According to the strict historical reality, there could never in the entire ancient world be another man who occupied in all respects such a unique position as Jesus, as soon as he had resolved to obey the divine call, which had been made possible in this Community, to become the Messiah. To know that he was the man who should at last come in this Community—the noblest and highest Community of the whole human race—as its expected consummator, and one advancing beyond the whole past of mankind, O, what boundless influences lay in this consciousness! Only in this Community could this consciousness arise in any human spirit: but if it once arose there without any deception, O what incomparable power and strength can dwell in that spirit for all true action and the establishment of what is now required! and what magic influences can flow forth from him upon all those who resolve to follow the impulse of his spirit in order to be with him in the kingdom of the Consummation which they perceive he is founding! In this case arrive a kingdom and a king such as had never come before: he represents in himself the kingdom of the perfected true religion, and radiates it from him as a true ruler in every word and every work that proceeds from him; but in contrast with all previous kings he uses and allows no other force than the power of the divine spirit itself; he occupies, as no man had occupied before him, a giddy height, and any, even the smallest false step, must precipitate him only so much the lower. Where, in all previous history, was ever such a position assumed by anyone? But he completely met all its requirements in his work also.

For before all things he took upon himself the whole task and duty imposed by this perfected true religion, and did not shrink back from the most difficult and most painful demand which it made. His burden in this respect was from the beginning a double one, inasmuch as he could not regard the perfect fulfilment of the divine will as the work of his individual life alone, but had to fulfil in it everything that was incumbent on him as the Messiah for the foundation of the perfect kingdom of God itself in a way never before attempted. Accordingly he descended into all the confusion and distress, and into all the deepest trouble which had accumulated since the beginning of human development upon the entire human race, and particularly upon

the history of the people of God itself, into a constantly heavier burden and more impenetrable mass, and to remove which was the more difficult in Israel precisely the higher it proudly supposed it stood, at least in religion, above the other nations. The love of God and the divine compassion for mankind, as the prophets from the time of Hosea[1] had recognised it as necessary, and believingly hoped for it in the future, as the one salvation for the people, and perceived it by the wrestling soul as the highest thing to be desired, so fired his heart that he, while he might like others, and more than others, have ruled in the world for his own advantage, and enjoyed abundantly its pleasures, made his entire regal life one sole service of others, and pure toil and labour,[2] according as his glance into the requirements of his divine mission as each occasion arose and his devotion to the divine will determined; while, on the other hand, he remained even in the deepest humiliation always a true king and ruler in inward superiority and lofty firmness. But this benevolent loving condescension and glad absorbing occupation with the real difficulties of things made into a steady law of life, is itself a good part of all higher true religion; and as he thereby showed to all without exception the right way to attain clear conviction and joy in God, so he supplied pre-eminently the one true model for all who seek in any matter to exercise dominion and authority.

The Christianity which, according to what we have seen above,[3] becomes with Christ's public appearance a present reality on the earth, in full operation and with all its peculiar characteristics, proceeded thus from a humble and hidden position in the world, which is the proper sphere of the most profound labour and the firmest foundation of everything that has to be raised to true glory and immortality. It was still the healthy view of those days, that the matters of religion always concern the whole nation: and that which is to obtain a firm foundation in a people must be established deep down amongst the general masses, and must go back into the most secret veins of the national life. The first beginning of the reign of the true religion on earth had formerly in the primitive times of the Community emerged from such a lowest depth of life;[4] how much more must that be the case now, when once more in the midst of this Community that had grown old, a still deeper foundation

[1] See especially vol. iv. pp. 132, 291 sq.

[2] Utterances such as Matt. xx. 22–28 express in this respect, simply in the briefest and most pointed form, what the whole history teaches generally.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 201 sq.

[4] See vol. ii. pp. 34 sq., 111 sq., 137 sq.

for the final consummation of this religion had to be laid, and difficulties had to be removed that had accumulated during the long course of human history, and which even the mightiest struggles of Moses and his time had not touched. It is true that from the long line of the centuries of the history of the people of God that had now passed, truths and prophetic surmisings the light of which had never shone on a Moses, might rise upon the spiritual soldier; but the task now was to realise them, which required the labours of a sympathetic absorbing descent into the deepest foundations of all national and all human life, a patience and a glad readiness to perform even the most difficult duties, such as had never hitherto been either required or attempted.

If we now go on to consider the general labours of Jesus in detail, it is impossible not to see that they necessarily consisted primarily in the proclamation and interpretation of the kingdom of God which he founded on the earth by his public appearance itself. For, on the one hand, it is quite true that everything which he did publicly, apart from his words and teaching, stood in the closest and most necessary connection with his whole work; indeed, at last he desired not to speak and teach, lest men should think that thereby alone his work was established in the earth, but as himself the first citizen and leader to found that kingdom the citizens of which all men must become;[1] so that all his actions became simply a constant founding of this kingdom, and all his speaking also had no other significance. But, on the other hand, inasmuch as the clearness of his thoughts was with him on all occasions a chief point, and nothing so greatly needed lucid exposition and intelligent defence as the nature, the legitimation, and the hope of the kingdom of God founded by him, speaking and teaching necessarily became to him nevertheless highly important, and of necessity, indeed, formed the deepest foundation of his own labours.

Jesus became, therefore, from the very beginning himself the first Evangelist, in this respect also bearing all the burdens of his vocation; and subsequently also there was not, until the

[1] Precisely by this Jesus distinguishes himself completely from Buddha, who, as a true saintly mendicant monk (and as such undoubtedly infinitely greater and nobler than those of our own day dating from the Middle Ages), endeavoured simply to teach, and from the first erected an insurmountable wall of separation between the saints, who formed apart a community, and the common people, as subsequently the Pope falsely introduced such a dualism into Christianity. But the ancient Community of Israel itself was of such a nature that as long as Christianity existed in its primitive purity it could not think of such a Buddhistic separation.

last limit of his earthly life, a single moment when even the least of his words did not flow from the centre of the one great matter which alone filled his soul; nor one which did not involuntarily serve for the illustration of the new truth which he brought into the world, and for its naturalisation there. He was not necessitated to teach like an ordinary Rabbi: for all that was true from ancient times he had no need in this Community to explain *de novo*; still less was it his province to reduce, like a philosopher of those times, all single phenomena to a general class, or to present all kinds of apparently wise propositions, or even brilliant conjectures, in explanation of actually or apparently obscure matters. It is true he does not evade questions of the Schools when they are pressed upon him, and does not regard them as beneath him;[1] he does not disdain to acknowledge and also expressly distinguish certain truths as higher and more comprehensive than others,[2] or even to bring various and dissimilar separate things into a general summary and series, when this is appropriate.[3] But he never presents anything that is but half thought out, never seeks a forced connection of thoughts and propositions, and never touches on anything that is in any way foreign to his one purpose. He varies his teaching without end to suit the particular subject and the particular class of hearers. It is sometimes the briefest and most reserved, at others it flows forth in calm fulness and wealth, entering into details and proving every point at length; sometimes it presupposes nothing but a knowledge of the everyday world and a sound understanding on the part of the hearer, teaching by a gradual ascent from the things closest at hand, while at other times it touches on the deepest mysteries of things without reserve and solves the most tangled questions; now it is merely suggestive and highly stimulative of further thought, and then again it teaches absolutely and asserts with the force of authority; or it is now the most gentle and consoling of all language, and then again the most severe and crushing. But in every kind and style it is uniformly perfect, telling, and exhaustive; neither do his speeches anywhere show any trace of that inclination to an artificial allegorical interpretation of the sacred Scriptures which had at that time become so lamentably common,[4] although they show how wonderfully he discovered and

[1] As such examples as Mark ii. 23–iii. 6; vii. 1–23; Matt. xxii. 15–46, plainly show.

[2] According to Matt. v. 48; vii. 12; xxii. 34–40, and similar passages.

[3] The great instance of which is Matt. vi. 9–13.

[4] See vol. v. pp. 257 sq. In this respect also the language of Jesus in the Gospel of John remains quite the same; in which fact lies also a special proof of the origin of this Gospel from John.

properly applied that which was most telling in the Old Testament for each particular occasion. Never have the profoundest views and the highest knowledge of this whole Messianic field been interpreted with such transparent lucidity and plain intelligibility, and at the same time with such varied wealth and inexhaustible fulness of treatment, with such simple stylistic truth and art, yet at the same time with such an irresistible charm and overpowering force. And never did the entire world of the animate and inanimate, of the human and animal creation, present itself as a symbol and an anteroom of the invisible and spiritual world so openly to a meditative eye as in this case, where even the world of the consummated kingdom of God has found in every aspect of it its perfectly characteristic portrayal. The telling brevity and exalted certainty of the ancient Oracle, as these features of it have been immortalised in the Old Testament, have here been amalgamated with the precision and easy mastery of the orator that permits the truth to prove itself, and with the charming gentle copiousness and graphic clearness of the teacher that descends to the child, so as to produce a style which never had any parallel either in Israel or in any other ancient nation. It is the perfect true religion which here at last makes itself understood to men in their own language with such directness and clear persuasiveness, and yet with such mighty force, that nothing superior to it can be conceived. Thus the teaching of Jesus presents itself to us in that work which had made it its object to preserve precisely this aspect of the recollection of him—namely, the Collected Sayings; and the numerous and long discourses of the Gospel of John still present the true reflection of it, although they were far more freely laid out, as not having been revived again till a considerably later period. Moreover, when elsewhere a genuine word from his lips has been preserved from other early books, it bears the impress of this unique spirit.[1] So that we may confidently say, that if only the sayings and discourses of Jesus belonging to the comparatively short period[2] of his public work had been preserved, we should possess in them alone a

[1] As regards the utterances of Christ which are not found in our four Gospels, see my essay in the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vi. pp. 40 sq., 54 sq. [now in the 2nd ed. of *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 144 sq., 160 sq.]; a peculiarly constructed parable, which is related to that of Matt. xxv. 14 sq., is quoted from the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews by Eusebius in the Greek fragments of his *Theophania*, published by A. Mays in the *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, t. iv. p. 155 (Roma 1847), [supplied in Hilgenfeld's *Nov. Test. extra Can.* fasc. iv. p. 17]. A saying, 'If ye do not make your base things high and your crooked things straight, ye will not enter into my kingdom,' is found in the *Acta Philippi* in Tischendorf's *Acta Apostolorum apocr.* p. 90; but it sounds rather like a mere echo of the more original and much more forcible utterances.

[2] According to pp. 151 sq. *ante*.

treasure of a most peculiar kind, the place of which it would be wholly impossible to supply.

Now, as Jesus never presented, nor wished to present, like an ordinary philosopher who makes his teaching his principal business, a connected summary or so-called system of what he deemed most worth knowing—although when the occasion arose or the time was fitting, he treated of many things connectedly [1]—it would be foolish to seek, in the face of this fact, to compose from his words that have been preserved such a system of doctrine. It is true he did not object to be greeted, according to the custom of that time, as 'teacher' (see below); but that was nothing more than a name borrowed from the prevailing custom of the day. Moreover, he could presuppose the truths of the Old Testament; and it was not his vocation to reduce the numerous doctrines it contained into a summary and teach them seriatim, which might be left for ordinary teachers to do. He had simply to teach what promoted the quite special work of his life, according as the situation or the time on each occasion required.

For all the sayings and discourses were again themselves but a characteristic part and one particular form of the work of this life. If we now consider, on the other hand, his deeds and their nature, it appears in the first place, that some of them were inseparably connected with the simple outward course of his history, or rather of the outward development of the object of his life—such as the arrangement of his itinerancy or his habitation in this or that quarter, the choice of the twelve, and many other matters of the same kind. But other acts appear to have been less controlled by circumstances, and at the same time to be almost constantly repeated in a similar manner, in which class we must place particularly the many deeds of healing of the most various kinds. Evidently the two classes of deeds must be carefully distinguished; and the question at once arises, what was the origin of such a distinction in the acts and deeds of Jesus as the Christ?

It is not difficult, however, to perceive that a similar distinction naturally runs through the actions of everyone that is occupied in any special life-work, vocation, or office. For some of the deeds of this character are naturally required at all times by the chosen or inherited vocation, so that they are indefinitely repeated; others mark rather the degree of progress and the stages of the work. There are daily works and

[1] As may be inferred from the arrangement of the Collected Sayings and the Gospel of John, different as these works are in other respects.

occupations, and there are deeds which are more infrequent, or even incapable of repetition; and this with kings and princes as well as with other workers.

As the Christ Jesus necessarily had what we may call his daily works, but his occupations could not consist simply in proclamations, discourses, and teaching; for indispensable as all this was in his case, as we have seen, such labours are after all, strictly speaking, not even specially regal. A king must act more than speak; indeed, the works which are constantly expected of him are deeds of power, victories over his own and his kingdom's enemies, the powerful protection of his own people, the energetic extirpation of the evils that prevent the prosperity or even the rise of his kingdom. And truly as an entirely different king from all that had hitherto existed must here arise, he had still to be a king, and as such found his kingdom of such a unique kind. If, therefore, he must like a king perform his deeds of power daily or hourly,[1] according as they were required, in order to found and establish his kingdom, it was still left free to him to choose such as corresponded to the perfectly original character of his kingdom. And in the case of this choice we have, as in all the traces of his work, simply to admire the unerring judgment of his regal mind. The kingdom of the perfected true religion must destroy the power and the ruinous consequences of sin; and with sin all human evils are connected in such a way that even physical ills receive from it their really dangerous and serious element. Accordingly, to lift the burden of all evil is the worthy object both of the constant regular work, and particularly of the deeds of power of the true king of this as well as of every kingdom that does not oppose his spirit. It could not be the purpose of Christ suddenly to remove by deeds of power the general hoary evils which cleaved to all the kingdoms of that time: they could not be so suddenly extirpated, because they had become everywhere too firmly entwined by a thousand roots with the national life to be removed permanently in any other way than by the spiritual transformation and renewal of the individual men themselves. Accordingly Christ directed his deeds of power primarily only against the serious evils which

[1] The proper term for them is *δύναμις*, *δυνάμεις*; comp. גְּדֻלּוֹת, Ps. cxlv. 3, 1 Chron. xvii. 19: connected with the *τέρατα*—indeed, essentially the same as they. After Mark the word is current of Christ's deeds of power in this sense in our present Matt., in Luke (both of his works), in Paul also, and similarly in the Rev.; while, on the other hand, it is wholly unused in any meaning of it in the writings of the Apostle John. But the more heathen word *τέρας* for Christ's works is intentionally avoided in the Gospels.

ravaged in individuals, confidently expecting that the more universal evils of the human kingdoms would of themselves diminish if only individuals had been made better. And what vastly injurious, dark, horrible evils, physical and spiritual, he met with amongst individuals, calling upon him to turn daily and hourly against them the whole force of his physical and spiritual action!

Innumerable diseases of mankind are in our own time still so mysterious as regards their ultimate causes; but to the ancient world they appeared to be not only mysterious, but often as also odious and deserving of all abomination. And if in the earlier times of this Community, according to many indications, the priests were obliged to occupy themselves more particularly with many classes of them which were injurious to the public generally,[1] they appear in these later days to have continued to take a kind of oversight of the lepers only as far as they felt constrained by the written Law to do so;[2] while the physicians, who were independent of them, and who had now been long since constituted a separate profession,[3] undoubtedly looked more after the health and wishes of the rulers and the rich than the welfare of the poorer populace. Moreover, during the last centuries, as we have seen,[4] a belief had become current amongst the descendants of the ancient nation in its decline, which of itself made many diseases more severe and added new ones to them. This is the belief of being possessed with evil spirits or *demons*,[5] and by these in endless numbers and of the most different kinds. Such diseased persons suffered, as far as we can now see, from violent, malignant mental paroxysms, from wicked exclamations and imaginations, or also from bad and often horrible convulsions; whether such diseased mental moods were connected likewise with special physical defects,[6] or that they existed alone, in which case they were probably always the most terrible and approached more or less nearly to madness. And nothing was more characteristic of the dark side of those times than precisely these

[1] See *Antiquities*, pp. 273 sq.

[2] Mark i. 44, Luke xvii. 14.

[3] From the time of Solomon, but subsequently in conflict with the priests; see vol. iv. p. 53, v. p. 267.

[4] *Ante*, pp. 86 sq.

[5] With the name δαιμόνιον (little demon), diminutive of δαίμων [see the author's work *Gott und die Bibel*, ii. p. 303], interchanges in Mark that of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, i. 26, 27, iii. 11, 30, v. 2, 8, 13, vi. 7, vii. 25, ix. 25; thence shortened πνεῦμα, Matt. viii. 16; the combination πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου is found Luke iv. 33 only.

[6] As in the cases Mark ix. 17, 25, Matt. ix. 32. Such cases as those where an evil spirit is ascribed to some one only by way of comparison or supposition, as Matt. xi. 18, John vii. 20, viii. 48, 49, do not belong at all to this class of evils.

sufferings. For though similar phenomena were found here and there in the nation at an earlier period,[1] strictly speaking the belief in a vast independent kingdom of evil spirits under a superior evil spirit, as it had now found its way into the nation generally, is hardly compatible with the ancient true religion; it was only through the increasingly powerful influence of the conceptions of the Eastern religions that it had spread to Palestine also.[2] But owing to the state of men's minds at this time, as they had become oppressed, distracted, and degenerated from such various causes, the belief had now long since found in Palestine an exceedingly fruitful field. Incontestably the true religion itself suffered in no small degree from this universal belief of the unlimited power of evil spirits over men; but the belief had at that time been quite firmly established, and had already found abiding expression in the popular language. Still, if the belief in demons was, as we have seen,[3] one of the plainest signs of the peculiar depression and languor of the mind of the people of the true religion at this period, this nation could not really have been the people of precisely this religion if the feeling had not arisen in its midst that such a state of things ought not to exist. The demons themselves feared the power of a higher spirit in the nation: this opinion prevailed,[4] and it could give its assistance to the man that did not shun an open struggle with them.

Now, Jesus as Christ descended with all the love and all the might of his spirit into the depths of this abyss of terrible suffering. To lend assistance in this dark region became his daily occupation, as men soon learnt generally, and everywhere sought his help. As far as we know, no one, not even the Baptist, had previously expected that he would undertake a daily labour and peculiar occupation of this kind, but he him-

[1] 1 Sam. xvi. 14, 16, 23; but in this case the demon is still conceived as proceeding from Jahveh.

[2] The books in which this belief first appears in its earlier forms, 'Isa.' xiii. 21, 22, xxxiv. 14, Bar. iv. 35, Tob. iii. 8, 17, vi. 7, 14, 15, 17, viii. 3, point to Eastern countries. They are the *dêvs* of the Persian religion, and they are also found in the Hindoo religion, *Journ. Asiat.* 1847, i. p. 33; but while they there represent rather occasional obscure evils, in Palestine for the first time the more spiritual nature of them is added by means of the higher religion that prevailed here. Further, comp. on the subject of the demons Jos. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 3, Lucian, *Philops.* ch. xiv. sq., Clem. *Hom.* iv. 9–23, iv. 15, 16, xix. 14, Porphyr. *de Abstin.* ii. 39, 40, 41–43, *Itinerarium Anton*, Mart. cap. xxv. xlii., *Qirq Vezir*, Paris ed., pp. 212–15. As late as the thirteenth century demoniacs were healed in Armenia, *Journ. Asiat.* 1858, i p. 447. See further from Syria, in most recent times, the report of *Forest* in *Ausland* for 1853, p. 719, and from Africa the report of *Tuschek* in the same periodical, p. 28. [See now the author's latest treatment of the whole subject of Biblical demonology, *Gott und die Bibel*, vol. ii. pp. 300 sq.]

[3] *Ante*, p. 87.

[4] Mark i. 24, v. 7 compared with Jas. ii. 19.

self knew why he chose it. As he laid the foundation of the perfected kingdom of God by his own laborious speaking and teaching, so he laboured daily for that kingdom in this most painfully toilsome work of relieving the deepest evils afflicting individual men. Not to shrink from the duty, the bravery, and the toil of such a removal of the heaviest calamities that can oppress man is the commencement of any salutary active work in the Community; and he also made the most difficult, most odious, and often most unthankful[1] part of this work his own voluntary daily business. And if it was the great mission of his life to pave the way for the powerful operation of the good spirit in the perfected kingdom of God as already begun, it was also his work to pursue the evil spirits into their darkest hiding-places, and thus, as it were, destroy the whole kingdom of Satan by first taking its most hidden and strongest places. For in consequence of the mysterious connection of calamity and sin, it was naturally implied, especially in his case, as the Christ, that he healed the sick with a view to winning them at the same time for the kingdom of the perfected religion. Undoubtedly it was primarily simply the profoundest compassion and the purest overflowing love for man which urged him to act in every such case,[2] whether the person cured should afterwards prove himself grateful or not; but it was impossible that all who had been healed by his deeds of power should remain ungrateful, and not recognise the sway of *that* power by which they had really been delivered.[3]

On this account his method of procedure in his cures was pre-eminently itself spiritual—that is, pervaded by the higher spirit that always guided him, and that streamed from him in all his deeds and actions, as well as in discourses and teaching. It is true that before him some had endeavoured to drive out demons:[4] but undoubtedly his intention and method of procedure in such cases were quite new. We are now able to rediscover the details of his method of curing disease in general only very imperfectly: all curative processes are generally

[1] Comp. Luke xvii. 12–18; and also John ix. 11 sq., and many other instances of the kind mentioned below in note 3.

[2] This follows so obviously and variously from the earliest and simplest narratives that it does not require special proof.

[3] For instance, in contrast with the nine ungrateful lepers out of ten who are mentioned by way of example Luke xvii. 12–18, the immovable faithfulness of the Mary from Magdala so often mentioned in the Gospels, from whom he had cast out seven demons, according to a remark preserved in a very brief form in the seventh Evangelical document [see Translator's Preface] Luke viii. 2, Mark xvi. 9! And that Bartimæus, Mark x. 46–52, would not have been so particularly described with regard to his very name if he had not subsequently become a constant, faithful follower.

[4] According to the indications in his own words Matt. xii. 27.

difficult to describe satisfactorily in a few words, and the most important element in them—the spiritual power, confidence, and bearing of the healer—cannot, by its very nature, ever be adequately represented in words. Further, though the Gospel of Mark purposely narrates somewhat more particularly the circumstances of some of the instances of his cures, so that this Gospel still remains for us, precisely for this feature of our historical knowledge also, the chief source; on the other hand, the other Gospels almost everywhere[1] either greatly abbreviate the more particular description of such circumstances, as appearing of less importance for the general reader, or else wholly pass them over. Still, when we examine the matter more closely, we are not left quite in the dark as to the chief points which were alone of decisive moment in his procedure. Primarily, we may say, it was the whole spirit of Christ which was operative in this case also, and which likewise sought to influence as powerfully as possible the spirit of the sufferer before all things. As nothing but the purest and most soul-absorbing faith in the ultimate celestial Healer inspired him, always conscious as he was of the measure and the aim of his powers of healing, and a previous radiant glance to heaven enlightened and strengthened him for the actual work,[2] so likewise he required before all things, if his healing act was to be effective, faith in the presence of the perfected kingdom of God, with all its boundless forces and powers; and neither could nor would heal where he did not find such a faith.[3] Just this is here the chief point, even for an understanding of the wholly unusual and greatest results: and what great results were possible in this case, when the highest faith on his part met with the most intensely expectant faith in him as the Christ! On the other hand, it would be in itself perverse, and contrary to historical indications that are still plain enough, to suppose that in his works of healing Jesus applied no suitable outward means. The earlier more lengthy descriptions,[4] or others which, for some reason or other, enter more into details,[5] plainly show how often he used such means,

[1] For if John in some passages, v. 2–9, ix. 6, 15, describes such processes somewhat more in detail, it is the really different meaning and object of his narratives that leads him to do so, while in Mark such descriptions are not subsidiary, but have an object of their own.

[2] See this constant trait in the descriptions Mark vii. 34 (comp. vi. 41); John xi. 41.

[3] Mark vi. 5, ix. 19–24.

[4] Mark v. 1–20, vi. 13, vii. 31–37, viii. 22–26, ix. 14–29: all in the highest degree original and graphic descriptions. Most remarkable is the mention of *oil* as a means of healing, Mark vi. 13, comp. Luke x. 34, Isa. i. 6: the use of oil continued in the primitive apostolic church, evidently in accordance with the example of Jesus, Jas. v. 14.

[5] John ix. 6, 15.

for instance, in the healing of the blind or the deaf. It is not less plain that, when it seemed to him necessary, he also made careful inquiries with regard to the outward circumstances of the disease in question.[1] It is true that in all cases the chief thing was the most forcible and immediate mental and spiritual influence, so that, when he put forth the utmost effort of his soul, he also often sent up prayerful sighs,[2] and this especially in the case of those diseases which were themselves more mental in their character, for instance, those that were supposed to come from evil spirits. Still, this very circumstance of his touching and laying his hands on the sufferer, and of his seeking to be disturbed as little as possible during the healing act,[3] points to the fact that his human operation (as need hardly be remarked) was regulated by the general laws of the divine order of the world, and that he by no means sought presumptuously to supersede them. Hence much of his power and skill in this respect, indeed, was transmitted to his disciples, taught to them by himself.[4] Original, displaying primitive force, most marvellously effective, was his work in this his daily occupation also, which he thus chose for himself as no one before him had done, since even the somewhat similar works of healing that occur previously in the case of the most powerful prophets[5] were of much smaller significance. And if every act of healing, particularly in those cases in which body and soul are most intimately reactive, forcibly reminds men of the existence of immeasurable spiritual forces, and all such acts, even in primitive times, appeared to the heathen as divine operations, this most difficult and responsible occupation, when undertaken conscientiously and seriously, is in his case carried in point of power to its greatest height, so that every act of healing performed by him could be regarded as a 'deed of power,' in point of extent and number to its widest significance, and in point of weal and blessing to its noblest glorification. Without doubt we cannot form too high an idea of this part of his general work, and must regard the entire

[1] As appears from Mark ix. 21, 22.

[2] Mark vii. 34, John xi. 33–38; see below.

[3] As Mark i. 31, v. 37–41, ix. 25.

[4] According to Mark iii. 15, vi. 7, Matt. x. 1, 8, Luke x. 17, 20, and the Acts of the Apostles. If subsequently the *Goetes* increased in those districts (comp. for the time of Vespasian Jos. *Ant.* viii. 2, 5), we may discern even in this degeneration the great power and the immense effects which this new force and skill of Christianity originally exhibited, and need not take it so much amiss in Celsus that, after he had seen this later degeneration, he called Jesus by this name (see Orig. *c. Cels.* i. *ad init.*).

[5] See vol. iv. pp. 83 sq., 104 sq. It never appears that those prophets made healing their daily occupation, as Jesus did; moreover, in their case there is nothing whatever said of demons.

human race as raised to his height after he had descended with his mind and heart into its deepest miseries: little as in other respects it is either possible or even profitable for us now to attempt to apply in imitation the outward means and manipulations by which his spirit once made itself felt in this sphere. Nor are they historically reported to us to a sufficient extent for such a purpose.

From these 'deeds of power,' which belonged, according to all the reminiscences, to his daily occupation, and the unlimited number of which is scarcely indicated in the Gospels,[1] those few deeds must be distinguished which surpassed them: the raising of the dead, the feeding of many thousands with a little bread and a few fishes, the related change of water into wine, the calming of the storm, the walking on the sea, and the acts of healing at a distance as by the emanation of spiritual influence.[2] For certain as it is that all these reminiscences likewise belonged to the most original portions of the Evangelical narrative, these deeds are nevertheless manifestly not in other respects to be placed on an equality with those before described; as they of themselves occupy a higher position, so also they occur far less frequently, and are, according to the meaning of the oldest tradition itself, only, as it were, detached prominent summits to which his entire power over external things rose in certain rare moments. And, as a fact, we know very well that there is not only an ordinary, customary course of work, the various constituent labours, deeds, and results of which repeat themselves without end, but also there are emitted from every course of work, the more energetic, active, and regular it is, unexpectedly new and still brighter sparks and flashes, and every labour of that kind always conducts to another that is still higher, until at last perhaps it touches and sets in motion the highest thing possible. But in the case of Christ, his ordinary daily work was itself an unbroken series of deeds of power; what, therefore, must those deeds have been which in certain rare moments rose above his ordinary labours, as from the combined force of his spiritual powers which had been called into the greatest activity! In so far there is, accordingly, no reason whatever why we should seek to determine the limits of the measure of spiritual powers, and arbitrarily fix how far they reached in the case of Jesus in their highest

[1] According to Mark i. 32–34, 39, 45, iii. 8–12, 15, and many similar passages in all the Gospels.

[2] The latter in such cases as Matt. viii. 13, Mark v. 27–34; John iv. 47–53; also the reverse case of a curse Mark xi. 12–14, 20, 21, would have to be brought into this class, but see the remarks thereon below.

exercise; on the contrary, we must admit that even the highest spiritual effort always seeks still loftier results than the greatest that have at any time been already attained; and we must be glad that this is a general law and that the life of Christ also illustrates it in such a powerful manner. But this exceedingly mighty exertion and agitation of the inmost powers of the loftiest and purest spirit, as it made itself felt in Christ and moved the world by its action, was soon responded to in such a way by the intense expectation and the glad faith of his followers, that this faith in such rare moments saw all the great things realised that it had anticipated and hoped for from him. And it was evidently only from the conjunction of these two spiritual movements that those conceptions and narratives of such rare highest effects and deeds of power arose, in which, as in some most mysterious surmisings and deeply entranced conceptions, was expressed simply the immovable faith in the truth of the actual manifestation of all that is highest in Jesus. The highest longing had here found in actual experience, although but in the few highest moments of it, its complete satisfaction, just as purely divine things, as far as they are visible to mortal eyes, can only be thrown out, as it were, in certain sparks and thus leave some traces behind them. And if formerly a similar longing had sought to find satisfaction in the much lower prophetic personalities of Elijah and Elisha,[1] how much more was the longing in this case justified!

We must therefore compare with these few most prominent deeds of power the similarly few most remarkable signs in a closely related sphere of his life. If, side by side with the outward phenomena and events of every history, an inner history, arising out of the relation of the purely spiritual forces at work, develops itself and makes progress, which, though its meaning and object are long mysteriously veiled, at last passes sensibly and perceptibly enough into the outward world, so in the history of Jesus, side by side with the visible course of his career and works, as the highest conceivable of all outward

[1] Comp. vol. iv. pp. 84 sq., 101 sq. It is a baseless conjecture and a wholly unhistorical view that the New Testament narratives were derived from those of the Old Testament; but the deeds were certainly expected after the analogy of those of the Old Testament, and the narration of them now the more naturally takes a similar form. Since in the history of the ancient people of Israel all that is important for the true religion is most closely connected, and the books of the Old Testament were then so very generally read, the substance of those Old Testament narratives undoubtedly now exercised great influence in various ways; but as in the case of Christ, only in such a manner that his nature and work nevertheless far transcend those of the ancient prophets (Luke ix. 54, 55), so also in the case of the Gospel narratives, only in such a way that the Old Testament narratives produce some effect upon their form and tone.

histories, there runs constantly parallel, as it were, a higher purely celestial history, in that (as we may say) the celestial powers constantly attend the outward life, anticipating and following it. This is the history of the nature of the attitude heaven assumes to earth, and of heaven's attendance upon this highest history in all its stages: silently generally, and only to be perceived by the organs of faith and prophetic presentiment. Still, the celestial voice and the celestial significance break forth irresistibly and powerfully at certain extreme points and summits of this history, and perceptibly even to those who at other times determine to see and hear nothing: for instance, at the baptism,[1] and at a few other moments of equal elevation, as we shall see subsequently. And the few signs which thus heaven makes from its mysterious silence can also express most perfectly the highest facts that are here possible and also actual. The history of religion is precisely the history of the celestial truths as they make themselves felt in every form and manner.[2] As now these few celestial signs permit the highest facts to be in their manner surmised, and give their response to the believing soul as it longs to hear the celestial judgments regarding the highest things of this history, so likewise the few deeds of power that stand out prominently from the great mass of the ordinary ones permit the highest effects to be surmised that seemed conceivable in the general deed-power proceeding from Christ, and they must be regarded by us rather as indications which suggest the infinite things that lie hidden in his history.

But although Jesus might publicly perform a deed of power, he never did it with a view to show thereby that he was invested with regal authority and to attain thereby some special object, as if he required such outward striking proofs of his divine vocation as the Messiah: simply as urged by love and compassion did he give help by his deeds as the moment called for it; and every one of his deeds of power, whether it was the smallest or the greatest, was always at the same time a pure deed of love, bearing the glorious distinction that it always flowed from the most immediate stirrings of the most enlightened compassion. Every such act diminished the load of the sufferings of the people, caused a higher activity, delivering and redeeming, from motives of purest love to be surmised, revealed the exalted and powerful royal sway of his spirit, and became readily a new stone for the broad and deep foundation of the kingdom of God which he proclaimed

[1] *Ante*, p. 194.

[2] See *Jahrbb. der B. W.* i. pp. 147 sq. [now *Die drei Ersten Evang.* i. pp. 38 sq.]

and himself brought: but not one of them was performed in order to arouse the attention of the people and fix it upon the worker. Indeed, he did not perform one of them, as so many of the ancient prophets had done, to arouse in the first instance faith in his words, or in order to supply a preliminary proof of them, in case men would not accept them. As late a prophet as Isaiah was obliged to demand faith, if not in his words yet in the miraculous signs which he was prepared to give as a pledge of their truth;[1] and as long as the true religion remained imperfect, the prophets were obliged so often to be content, by wonderful deeds that excited astonishment and sensation, to direct the faith of men at first simply to certain marvellous acts to be performed by them, that it might be seen whether men would on account of the latter be brought to believe also in their simple words and truths.[2] Now, after the perfected true religion had appeared with Jesus as the Christ, it demanded faith simply for religion's own sake. It is true the men of this later age delighted above all things in such wonderful works,[3] partly because they read with pride in their sacred Scriptures so many narratives about them as having formerly taken place amongst their ancestors, partly because every declining nation is always most glad to suppose that it can be delivered by the occurrence of such marvellous deeds of individual men, and thereby only betrays its own want of true strength and willing self-sacrifice. But on that very account Jesus yielded the less to this slothful desire for miracles and this indolence of faith, and rebuked sternly all who demanded, or even expected, that he must first by his miraculous deeds prove before their eyes that he was the Christ.[4] Accordingly it was only his inexhaustible power of love that led him from one deed to another, which filled the world with astonishment without his desire and endeavour. And his entire course of public activity becomes a series of miracles such as had never been witnessed before, which necessarily roused even the most unbelieving from their torpor, and ought to have sufficed as indications of the totally new life of unparalleled healing and strengthening energies that was operative in this case, if so

[1] See *Prophets of the Old Testament*, ii. pp. 13 sq., 81 sq.

[2] See *ibid.* vol. i. p. 53, and vol. iii. pp. 62 sq., for the case of Jeremiah.

[3] According to 1 Cor. i. 22 and so many other evidences of the most varied kind.

[4] Matt. xii. 38 sq., xvi. 1–4, Luke xi. 16; this is most distinctly dwelt on by John in various ways, from ii. 18, 19 onwards, where the desire for miraculous signs is subtly ridiculed, to such open declarations as iv. 48, vi. 30 sq., xiv. 11. But the same John remarks, x. 41, not less significantly than correctly, that the Baptist performed no miracles, and Jesus therefore after all surpassed him in this respect also.

many of his contemporaries had not from a wholly perverse mind, and often only for a pretext to cover their indifference, or for contention's sake, continued to demand from him wholly different miracles of apparently a still higher kind; arbitrarily to demand which really nothing but their own obdurate unbelief could move them. But the deeds which he really performed even daily were in fact, even without his intention, wonderful enough to arouse deeper reflection and genuine faith in his higher mission; and certainly all the individual deeds of such a spirit must serve to remind those who do not as yet comprehend the full truth that is being explained, and have not an immovable faith in it, that they have before them a hidden something of a higher nature; and in the case of Christ those deeds must the more serve this purpose in proportion as he aimed at something high and very difficult for his immediate contemporaries to understand. After, therefore, the earlier Gospels had simply endeavoured to preserve the memory of such miraculous deeds, as if the simple hearing of them alone must make anyone sufficiently attentive to the higher facts that lie hidden behind them, and in such moments spring into stronger light, John then, as he looks back upon everything more calmly in the more distant past, dwells especially upon the proposition, that though the whole truth of Christ ought to be believed simply for its own sake, yet those who refuse to be moved to deeper reflection and the beginning of faith even by the works, as the visible, easily discernible evidence of this spirit, are so much the more inexcusable.[1] In this proposition he really gives utterance to the most correct statement of the case conceivable.

But in no respect did Jesus, properly speaking, either do or say anything simply with a view to being acknowledged by men as the expected Messiah: and this is precisely the most marvellous fact, and also one that best corresponds to his proper dignity and mission. He proclaimed the nature, the duties, and the hopes of the perfected kingdom of God; he acted in every respect as if that kingdom were already present, as it was in fact in full operation by his whole work, and he had thus a perfect right constantly to maintain from first to last that it was already actually present. What would it have availed, indeed, if he had above all things insisted simply upon the acknowledgment and reverence of himself as the Messiah? Did he desire to be a king like any who had preceded him? Or

[1] See *Jahrbb. der. B. W.* iii. pp. 166 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 126.]. *Die Johanneischen Schriften*, i. pp. 28 sq.

should he even direct the attention and the suspicion of the world too early to himself as to one desiring to be called a king? Firmly as he was convinced of being the promised one, and infinitely clear and confident as his regal assurance thereby became in his own soul, he did not seek and did not desire outward honour and subservient acknowledgment, or an acknowledgment that was designedly produced in any way, whether by force or by flattery. Accordingly he chose for himself a name which, significant as it might be by its origin for every finer ear, was still at the same time the most modest and attractive by which he could designate himself; and, although borrowed from the Old Testament, it received, like everything else that he took from that source, as it were an entirely new meaning upon his tongue. This is the name *Son of Man*, taken incontestably from that passage of the Book of Daniel in which the Messiah is represented as coming at the beginning of the divine kingdom to the divine judgment-seat, borne upon clouds, moving like angels and mingling with the host of them assembled before that seat, and yet still appearing as a man simply (without wings) and in this respect distinguished from them.[1] When he applied this name to himself, no attentive and instructed reader of the Old Testament could mistake the exalted meaning which must attach to it: for the name had been repeated in the Book of Enoch,[2] a book which, like the Book of Daniel, was then much read by the friends of the Messianic hope, and undoubtedly by others also; and even the earliest Christians designated Christ thus by preference when he was conceived as coming in his celestial glory to judgment.[3] But when he designated himself as the Messiah precisely by this simple general name, *the Son of Man*, that really involved the same indescribable self-renunciation, love, and condescension which was involved in all his labours, and men did not suppose they heard the King and the God, but simply the man and son of man; although, at least for the thoughtful hearer, there must have been conveyed by the name a reference to the Book of

[1] See *ante*, pp. 112 sq.

[2] And, indeed, very frequently, and even already in a changed form also; see *ante*, p. 113. Since precisely that portion of the present Book of Enoch in which the name thus occurs was written only a few decades after the Book of Daniel, it may thence be inferred that the name must also really refer to the Messiah in the latter book also: but in fact it cannot of itself signify anything else. Comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iii. pp. 231 sq., viii. pp. 189 sq., xi. p. 279, and previously my note on Rev. i. 13 in my *Comment. in Apocal.* (1828).

[3] As Acts vii. 56 shows. He is also meant, Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14, by *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, in spite of the absence of the article caused by the peculiar nature of the contexts. But the Gospel of John already uses the name as a variation of that of *Son of God*.

Daniel, and thereby to Messianic conceptions. This name he accordingly used most naturally when he spoke especially from the mind and the elevation of the Messiah; he never suffered himself, however, to be designated king by his disciples, but by the names which were then customary amongst the disciples for other men.[1]

Thus he worked as a man amongst men, a friend amongst friends, a constantly benevolent and tender healer and helper amongst the suffering and necessitous; rigorously refusing all external honour and flattery, indeed the very appearance of it:[2] and yet never before in any nation had such a man, such a friend, and such a helper appeared. He seemed to be rather the opposite of a king and ruler, and yet every one of his utterances was genuinely regal, all his acts one unbroken series of most royal deeds of power, decisions, and regulations, and his entire public work the noiseless and yet most appropriate founding of an eternal kingdom. There was nothing that he seemed less to be than the founder of a new community, and indeed, of a new kingdom; and unexpectedly, under his labours and his influence, there had risen out of the ancient community a new one, and in it the most imperishable and unbounded kingdom of which this earth can be the sphere. But when he at any time finds occasion to put forth distinctly his entire Messianic power and authority, at once the full severity of his word and command is irresistibly presented; and this again, never more readily than when he had to lighten the heavy yoke of prejudice and error, and in God's stead to heal what was diseased.[3] And if he had also, at the proper place, to show his royal severity in censure and rebuke, his whole work was nevertheless constantly as full of mercy and love as of truth and sincerity;[4] in this also truly kingly, and indeed

[1] As *Rabbi* or (in Mark x. 51, John xx. 16) *Rabbûni* (dialectical form of *Rabbôni*), according to a somewhat more definite term; instead of which Luke always, and the other Gospels sometimes, use διδάσκαλε. Everyone who was followed by disciples could be thus designated, not excepting those that had not studied in the learned school at Jerusalem, as Jesus according to express evidence (see *ante*, p. 189) was not a 'scholar' in this sense. The original distinction between *Rabbûni* and *Rabbi* I have stated in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, p. 1027, and 1866, p. 1831 [that the former is used in direct address, and its longer form appears to be a diminutive ending expressive of endearment]. As regards the question whether the name 'Rabbi' was actually in use at all at the time of Christ, see my observations, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1854, pp. 1086 sq.: substantially, the doubt, which was first raised in our time, is dispersed by the remarks previously made, *ante*, p. 19. Similarly the name *Abba* was then in use, according to Matt. xxiii. 9, for the heads of schools or cloisters; but the origin of the name is very old, according to vol. iv. p. 82. A special testimony as regards the age of the name is supplied by the proper name *Barrabban*; see below in connection with the crucifixion. [Comp. *Prophets of the Old Testament*, v. p. 324.]

[2] As Mark x. 17, 18.

[3] As Matt. ix. 6, xii. 8.

[4] What is said once—Luke iv. 22,

glorifying and ennobling in the highest degree everything that had to that time been a true part of royalty. There radiated from him in everything simply that infinite truth which entirely possessed him, and he dispensed inexhaustibly simply from that exaltation and grace and love which were without intermission the breath of his spirit; just as in himself boundless divine serenity and victorious joy prevailed, constantly and uniformly producing an effect on the world around him, and on special occasions breaking forth more powerfully.[1]

3. *As regards his glance into all times.*

Thus working as the Christ upon the true basis and in the one correct way, he could finally enjoy also that exalted and calm confidence in his reflections on all times and all results, which is to no one more indispensable than the man who proposes to work as a ruler and leader; and he could, although labouring in his own time and his own nation only, and, moreover, only for a very limited period, still bear in his soul, as the first citizen in the perfected kingdom of God, the divine consciousness of becoming at the same time its eternal spiritual stay and its human-divine conscience.

Having come to a nation which boasted, not unjustly, of being before all others the 'people of God,' and having been placed in its history again, as the long-desired and expected one, on the border of a wonderfully long, grand, and profound development, it was a primary necessity that he should lose nothing of all that was eternal in the past, nor overlook anything that had already been gained in the nation. And, as a fact, he neither lost nor overlooked the least part of all the eternal truths and possessions that had here been supplied. On the contrary, upon the basis of that Consummation to which the past tended and logically conducted, and which in him first became reality and truth, he for the first time commanded the proper view of all the past. No one before had found so profoundly as he the eternal and purely divine elements existing in the ancient possessions of the nation without being allured

John i. 14, 17, in the words of the Evangelists—is simply the reflection of all that we know historically of him; although the early Collected Sayings, and accordingly the original Gospel of Matthew, gave greater prominence to his pure exaltation simply in contrast with the scribes, Matt. vii. 28, 29, Mark i. 22. But in fact the Hagiocracy, and in this again the Biblical scholars, had, according to the whole course of the historical development of the nation, to be that power in opposition to which his superiority made itself most sensibly felt. Thereby, however, his general exaltation and superiority suffers in no respect.

[1] As Matt. xi. 25–30, Luke x. 21–24.

and deceived by the brilliant mirage of allegory, and no one else had known how to apply the lasting truths therein in all cases so appropriately as he.[1] But on the other hand no one had perceived the merely temporal and transiently limited elements of those possessions so clearly, and explained them at the right place with such perfect freedom and so unreservedly as he.[2] If now the matter of chief importance generally was correctly to discern and equally firmly and clearly to carry out those perfect things to which the past of itself tended, and which had been already latently involved in it, it may be said that no one taught and put into practice these perfect things as the duty of the perfected kingdom of God so correctly and with such unequalled truth, both generally and in detail, as he. So that with regard to this important matter he could justly boast that he had not come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, or the things of the past as far as they were sacred, and must, as sacred, be eternally valid, but to fulfil, or perfectly carry out, what they really meant, and thus to bring the past to its own consummation.[3] The Law and the Prophets, however, as the bases of the true religion, aim at nothing else than that that which they really proclaim—the divine will—may be fulfilled by man, not partially or wrongly, but perfectly and according to its true nature; this is the consummation of the true religion, the correct understanding of which Christ supplies, presenting it everywhere by his teaching and his own actions. If the perfected true religion thus makes its appearance, or that which the Law and the Prophets by their inmost tendency aim at, it is true there arises a great distinction as regards the past observance of the ancient laws and institutions. Many things which, in conformity with the sacred Scriptures as unspiritually applied, and with traditionary usage, were taught in the schools as the highest wisdom and duty, and indeed, the entire Hagiocracy, as based upon a misunderstanding and misapplication of what was truly sacred, must pass away; and in that simply the highest, eternal, and most essential things remain as duty, there arises thereby a new simplicity, sincerity, and sense of relief in the midst of the complicated situations of the present life,[4] to maintain which with faithfulness now becomes the true work of life. Thus old things become eternally new; and that scholar, or scribe, who has discerned

[1] The instances Matt. ix. 13, xii. 3–5, xxii. 31, 32, John x. 34–36, may suffice as examples; and anything more than such examples is not here required.

[2] As the instances Matt. xix. 8, John vii. 22, show.

[3] See *Die drei ersten Evang.*, 2nd ed. pp. 263 sq.

[4] Matt. xi. 28–30, and, in contrast therewith, xxiii. 2–4.

the nature and the duty of the perfected kingdom of God and labours in it with living freshness, never repeats in a merely barren way the things of the past, or, no less unprofitably, produces new things simply for his own pleasure, but recognises those things of the past that are eternally true, and thus produces new things with living freshness and truth as they are required by the present and yet do not contradict the past; he casts forth from his inexhaustible treasury things new and old,[1] as the example of Jesus himself so admirably teaches. But if to approach that which is perfect and never to shrink from it, but to come ever nearer to it, is itself an infinite task, he teaches that *faith* is here both the most essential and the most marvellously powerful thing.[2]

But for the present he confined himself, with all his hardest toil and labour, to Israel, as it then continued to dwell within the limits of the ancient sacred territory, kept together as a nation by the religious bond of union, though it had been divided, contracted, and externally much weakened. And in this respect again, nothing can so certainly show the unsurpassable wisdom and correctness of his action as this self-restriction which he so firmly observed. For it was only in Israel that everything had in fact long ago been prepared for the Consummation which it was his sole vocation to bring; it was here only that he could demand, and himself do, the highest duties, as really naturally to be understood by all as implied in the past development of the people and the precepts and prophecies of the sacred Scriptures; and it was here only that, side by side with the deep indelible feeling that the Consummation must at last come, and the firm hope therein in the hearts of many of those who had not been so corrupted by the fashionable sins of the time, there was found the possibility of immediate faith in the Consummation and the readiness at once to do and to suffer everything for it. Neither could there at that time arise the smallest doubt as to all this; every member of this nation who had not wholly degenerated still felt within him, in all questions regarding religion and its significance and reign in the earth, an impulse, an inherited pride, and a devout hope, such as were possible in no heathen nation, and precisely at this time (as we have seen) if possible more strongly than ever before. But if the true religion had at last been sufficiently perfected in that people in the mysterious womb of whose history this could

[1] Matt. xiii. 52.

[2] Matt. viii. 10–13, ix. 2, 21, 28, 29, xv. 28, xvii. 20, xviii. 6, xxi. 21, 22, 32, xxiii. 23, and still further carried out in John.

alone be effected, it must then go forth into the wide world and become a possession of the entire race. The history of the years immediately following Christ's appearance and work has also plainly enough shown all this; but it deserves our highest admiration that he, at a time when the ancient national unity of Israel had been so greatly weakened and so many members of Israel lived amongst the heathen, even in honoured and influential positions, nevertheless still confined his entire labours so persistently to this nation within its ancient boundaries,[1] and never forgot that he was sent primarily only 'to the lost sheep of Israel.'[2] Accordingly he also adapted himself willingly to the sacred precepts and customs of this people, and lived simply and honestly as one from its midst. Indeed, the perfected divine-human life can—in fact must—be possible in every situation and under every outward fetter, since it would never have been possible in the case of one man, if it had not been so under every outward condition of life and every outward limitation and national shape. But it stands to reason that at the same time he kept constantly in view the final spread and sway of this perfected true religion over the whole earth;[3] that he also departed from his custom of having intercourse with Judeans only when and as it appeared to him practicable and necessary according to his higher designs;[4] and that he did not spare even the oldest and most sacred customs and the most recent prejudices of his nation when the disregard of them immediately promoted the Consummation which he brought.[5]

Further, he limited himself in his present work even, as we saw above, to his simple proclamation that the kingdom of God was already present, to his exposition of its nature, duties, and hopes, and to his own labouring as if it was already present, without beginning his work as if he had desired for himself from man the Messianic acknowledgment and homage, acting with Messianic authority only when it was absolutely required. But this acknowledgment and the enthusiastic conviction that he was the Messiah soon enough came to him all the more surely and lastingly from those whose love could be of value to him,[6] even the more he desired often to repulse

[1] How easily he could have done the contrary appears from John xii. 20 sq., comp. vii. 35.

[2] Matt. x. 6, xv. 24.

[3] According to Matt. viii. 10, 11, xxi. 33–43, xxiv. 14, and other passages.

[4] Matt. viii. 10–13, xv. 21–28, John iv. 7 sq.

[5] As Mark ii. 6 sq., 16, 17, 24 sq., iii. 2, vii. 1 sq., and elsewhere.

[6] When at times profound reverence and prostration before him as before a great ruler is spoken of, as Mark i. 40 (various reading), v. 6, vii. 25, x. 17,

and refuse it. Thus he dominated already the present with all the nascent future, while all the time he only served it by helpful and unwearied activity: and thus he gave on the highest scale the one true example of the method by which on a smaller scale every form of beneficent rule over men can be permanently obtained. Undoubtedly it is obvious that the acknowledgment of Jesus as the fully authorised founder of the Consummation would not have been effected in such a short time so profoundly and permanently, if the expectation of a Christ had not been established so generally and firmly that to him who seemed to fulfil it the hearts of men the more readily responded and adhered to him the more believingly when he seemed to fulfil it perfectly. The fact also that his descent from David was generally known,[1] unmistakably contributed in the case of many for a considerable time to sustain the greater expectations from him,[2] although he himself attached no weight to it whatever. But at all events he never showed himself unworthy of this most illustrious descent in Israel, and who can measure the secret combined effects of all such spiritual incentives that had now actually been at work in Israel during the previous two thousand years! Who is in a position to assert that the last great result of the whole history of Christ must have been the same even if the conviction of his Davidic descent had not played its part in all the agitatoin of the Messianic movement which then ran so high? When in the life of a people or a community everything at last tends to a tremendous decision and a final consummation, all the impulses and tendencies that had ever been felt strongly in such a corporate body revive once more at last, and all make one more attempt with their whole remaining energies. We may therefore say, the concurrence of two wholly different forces which we saw above[3] in the case of Christ himself, and which was possible only in this nation and at this time, was thus met with once more in another manner, but not less productive of effect in the case of several of the first disciples; and as it is generally in the spiritual world also the concurrent meeting of two wholly different forces for one aim which first produces the

Matt. ix. 18, xiv. 33, xvii. 14, xx. 20, it follows as a matter of course both that he could not always restrain such sudden impulses of others, and that such impulses with regard to him were not in themselves unallowable, since they in fact only implied the acknowledgment of the Messianic dignity. Moreover, it is manifestly the last author of the first Gospel who most affects this form of description; and John narrates such an instance only once, ix. 38, although that once with great significance.

[1] See *ante*, pp. 183 sq.

[2] See the passages *ante*, p. 184, and the remarks on Matt. xxi. 9, 15, *infra*.

[3] Pp. 212 sq.

most marvellous results, we may also see the law exemplified here plainly enough. But the point of greatest moment on which everything here again really depends is, that he not only satisfied such highly strained expectations, but was also strong enough even to rectify and to control them where they contained dubious and uncertain elements. So that in this sense also he occupied a position of authority over them, and only that which was eternal and necessary in them guided him.

And thus he could also have that exalted certainty concerning the future, infinitely difficult and great as it loomed before him; and if everything in him that we have previously dwelt upon is so wonderful, this calm assurance about the future appears still more so, and yet it is explained by all that we have previously seen. As certainly as he fully brought upon the earth by his general work the perfected kingdom of God in its entire inner nature or spirit, in the only way it could come, and established it upon the earth indestructibly, though at first but on a small and unimposing scale, so he also foresaw its outward extension and final complete predominance with that infinite inward certainty of assurance which never permitted him amid all coming errors and sufferings in the least to doubt this fact, and which made him in the end the last great prophet of it. Everything that the ancient prophets had foretold concerning the consummation of the kingdom of God pointed accordingly primarily to him and his spirit; and none of their predictions were altogether without meaning and appropriateness, as he perceived and as the matter itself implies: yet when and where the last of these prophecies, with their vast extent and infinite grandeur, would be fulfilled, that was a matter which he could only leave to God Himself.[1] It was his calling to make forthwith the one true commencement of the realisation of all these prophecies, such an incontestably proper commencement that all further fulfilment must connect itself therewith and make it the basis of further progress: but as the fulfilment, as the complete definite reality, nevertheless takes always an entirely different form from that which anyone, whoever he may be, can foresee in detail, and every true prophecy can thus be valid only in respect of its inner truth, to the extent to which it correctly anticipates in general outline something future as divinely necessary, so the beginning of the fulfilment of all ancient Messianic prophecies which he effected, with his sure glad vision of the victory, had

[1] And he did so, as is proved by the utterance Matt. xxiv. 36; on this matter see further below.

in fact immediately taken a different form from that which anyone had previously foretold in detail. Therefore he perceived certainly, even from the very first, that from that moment when the actual terrestrial foundation for the perfected kingdom of God should be laid by him, a great division with reference to his own work on earth and his whole history, must take place in the substance of those prophecies as well as in the further development of the kingdom of God. It was in fact generally a great advantage that the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament were so extraordinarily multiform and indeed various, and like a whole world in miniature: as therefore this their great richness, unfixedness, and spirituality had been from the commencement in his favour, for instance, not compelling him to appear from heaven as a winged celestial being, but as a genuine man like others, so now the same characteristics constantly lent him great assistance in the course of his labours. Accordingly he worked daily for the fulfilment of that part of those extensive and elevated prophecies which could immediately be realised, being content to do this in the right way: but that part of them which could not be at once or even during his earthly life fulfilled, he left calmly, without arbitrarily fixing its limits, to Divine care to continue, concerned himself only always at the right moment to carry properly to completion in the one great cause whatever the time just then required. For if even the smallest thing done in accordance with the Divine will is taken up by the Divine unresting activity, how much more must his life-work be taken up, which was the true commencement of all Divine-human co-operation in the kingdom of the Consummation itself. And thus he could know and daily learn more plainly that a great all-comprehensive division of this kind was being effected; and he could leave to the Father that part of the mysteries of the future which it behoved him thus to leave, when in every moment of the present he followed, in the prosecution of the Messianic work which had now at last been properly commenced, Him and His will as in fact he followed Him. Or, to use the former[1] briefer term, the kingdom of God was accordingly not less already present than still future, and neither present nor future partially, simply according to his will.

For that is ultimately again the highest characteristic of him, that he in everything anticipated and in everything followed the Divine will alone, not merely in that first exalted moment

[1] *Ante*, pp. 201 sq.

of the commencement of his work, but always and uniformly. The world resisted soon enough his work in the most various ways, friends and foes imperilled it; and because his work was the highest, the hostility to him also soon became the highest and his sufferings the deepest: his task was, inasmuch as this is the task of all true religion, to follow in all things alone the Divine will at every one of the infinitely various stages of his work and life—indeed, even to anticipate its slightest intimations; and he did not for a single moment fail to accomplish this task. Not as if some mysterious thing had compelled him never to resist the divine will; he could have resisted it, he rebuts the temptation;[1] and precisely the fact that he always immediately rebutted it is the secret of his constant co-operation with the Divine will and the invincible force of his whole genuinely Messianic work.

It cannot be doubted that with this bent and aim of his spirit he was from the very beginning prepared also for the profoundest sufferings and the hardest fate. The thought of the Messianic obligation which still weighed upon the nation as a heavy burden conducted of itself to the idea of a *sacrifice* which had to be offered for it: and it is this thought which sustained the entire Messianic movement from the first appearance of the Baptist; and if he sought to impose upon the nation that sacrifice which should make it capable of properly receiving the coming Messiah, and had then[2] suspected in Jesus as he submitted to baptism the man who would take upon himself as a propitiatory sacrifice all the remaining obligation of the past, it follows naturally from that that this figure of a sacrifice in its highest significance was constantly present to the mind of Jesus, and his whole Messianic work became to him in so far a life which he was prepared to sacrifice at any moment for the salvation of men.[3] Still in this also it was in his estimation a higher duty not apathetically and blindly to forestall the Divine will; and as, together with the clearest perception and the most original endeavour, he was moved by the inexhaustible power of purest love alone, and never lost this love even amid the most profound sufferings,[4] so he had also in the limited period

[1] Matt. iv. 1–11, xvi. 23, Mark x. 17, 18; apart from such pangs of soul as could suddenly surprise him, as Matt. xxvi. 38 sq.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 192 sq.

[3] The words Matt. xx. 28, comp. x. 39, John xv. 13 only reproduce most plainly the thought which was certainly never unfamiliar to him from the very first. If Paul, Rom. ix. 3, has no higher wish than to be able to offer himself up for the salvation of his people, this thought as the Apostle expresses it, is peculiar to himself; but it undoubtedly lived in Christ in incomparably higher repose and clearness from the first day of his Messianic labours.

[4] *Ante*, p. 210.

of his public labours his days of most serene joy and rest, and certainly never was a high life-work begun and uniformly continued to its appointed earthly term amidst all manner of difficulties with a brighter joyousness and assurance of victory than his. At the same time, the days in which the most serious mortal dangers press upon a man more and more closely and inevitably, are very different from those in which they first threaten from a distance, or are even by human wisdom to be avoided, because in such dark days wholly different temptations approach him.

We therefore trace here first of all the detailed development of his history only to that point where the most extreme dangers, such as no earthly wisdom could escape, already threaten his life. This period, embracing some four and a half years,[1] was, however brief in comparison with the work done, still fully sufficient to show to the world how Jesus acted as the Christ, and the shape his whole work on the earth took in all its directions. And it is quite certain that never was so much accomplished and attained on the earth by one man in so short a time, and, moreover, amid such hindrances and dangers of all kinds. Nor can we, as we follow the exact and minute traces of the history, fail to see the most marked vicissitudes in the various experiences and phases of his life. But however manifold and various were the forms which this history assumed, it presents, nevertheless, everywhere one continuous course of progress as regards that which alone constituted its main object; and the constantly increasing opposition of the world serves only to help forward the life of Christ more and more definitely to its proper goal. We may therefore distinguish here three periods, according as the Messianic movement proceeding from Christ promises to extend itself more peacefully or is threatened by the most powerful obstructions, and yet thereby only concentrates itself more and more profoundly upon its own proper foundation, until at last it rises to break through even the mightiest hindrances.

[1] According to pp. 151 sq. *ante*.

HIS TEMPORAL WORK.

I. Previous to the Imprisonment of the Baptist.

The beginning of his Messianic labours.

With regard to this earliest period of the public labours of Christ the historical sources of the first class are almost absolutely silent:[1] so distant was it in the recollection of the generality, and so certainly did his labours become incomparably greater and more public subsequent to the removal of the Baptist from the scene. We must therefore in every respect the more thankfully acknowledge the service John has rendered, in that he considered it as one of his duties to supply in his distinct Gospel precisely this defect: an important part of his work is devoted simply to this purpose; and although his book, in accordance with its prevalent custom, deems it superfluous to intimate this its design to supply the defect by a distinct statement, the design is nevertheless evident enough from the matter itself. We have the words and deeds of Jesus until he returned the second time from Jerusalem and Judea to Galilee, each time distinguishing at once his first entrance into Galilee by one of the most memorable miracles.[2] And if the first time he had found but little faith in Galilee as more specially his own country, in accordance with the well-known experience of the little honour met with by a prophet in his own country,[3] yet when he returned the second time from Jerusalem and Judea he found at once on his entrance into Galilee so much the more general acknowledgment and more hearty belief, inasmuch as he had in the south approved himself before all the world. This is the simple course of events as it is summarised by the

[1] It appears also from Luke iii. 23, where it is said that Jesus was about thirty years of age when he *began* his labours, that Luke did not, as has been subsequently inferred (see *ante*, pp. 151 sq.) from misunderstood words of his Gospel, regard the public labours of Christ as limited to one year: that *beginning* indicates plainly enough a longer course of labour, and certainly extending beyond one year; just as Luke chooses that same weighty word in a similar connection, Acts i. 1.

[2] John iv. 54 comp. with ii. 11: for this is the true meaning of these words. It follows from ii. 23, iii. 2, iv. 45, that many other miracles took place between these two, which are here mentioned only as specially memorable. It follows from the whole manner of these narratives therefore that the Apostle, really no less than the earlier narrators, considered the labours of Jesus in Galilee as the most important, but at the same time would not pass over those performed in the south of the country.

[3] The words John iv. 44, the meaning of which has been discussed above, p. 182, refer back plainly to the utterance of Christ mentioned Mark vi. 4 (Matt. Luke) as to one well-known, and are therefore without the latter somewhat unintelligible: but their reference is here plain enough from the other words, vv. 43–45.

Apostle in his reminiscences from that earliest period. And soon afterwards the Baptist must have been imprisoned; as this Gospel plainly enough intimates, though it does not specially state it.[1]

By their matter also these narratives supply undesigned evidence of being faithful recollections of the first days as they actually were. Everyone that accurately understands and vividly takes them in, soon feels how certainly Jesus, when he began to labour and to be acknowledged as Christ, must appear publicly in some such way as is here actually described: as if the Apostle had recalled to memory all the more gladly and carefully this part of the sacred reminiscences particularly, because they had been neglected by the previous narrators. Indeed, there is in so far a peculiar charm in these pieces of narrative: we are sensible here of the fresh, delicate odour of the first spring of the rising Christ, and we see him before our own eyes as he comes to his full greatness and power. If even the highest things that are historically possible, even at that time when their blossom tends to burst forth with all energy, could nevertheless only unfold as by sudden shoots when they were likewise aroused by the world itself as by the gentle fanning wind, so here we see clearly before our eyes how the world itself stimulates and urges Jesus at length to show himself for the first time both by unerring prophetic intuition and speech, and by deeds of power, as the Christ that he must become. But scarcely has he thus, neither pushing himself forward nor yet falling short of the just challenges that meet him, recognised his fully royal power already in actual exercise, when that power urges him, on the other hand, unchallenged by the world, to show himself both in action and teaching as the true ruler and king in his own territory; and he is also acknowledged even by those at a distance, if at first by only a few, yet by people of the most various kinds; until at last he can already permit the power of his spirit to work with ever-increasing force and potency. This is in this case the course of the unfolding of the spiritual forces that had once been set moving as it appeared in the reciprocal contact of the minds concerned;[2] and this course of progress was from its first

[1] After John iv. 54 there is therefore in so far a considerable pause, as is shown also by the transition to what follows v. 1. It follows from iii. 22–36, that the Baptist had not been imprisoned at that time: if therefore his imprisonment is not mentioned after iv. 54, it is simply presupposed as naturally to be inferred, partly from the earlier Gospels and partly from iii. 24; and from this it also follows that the event John iv. 47–54 is intentionally placed at an earlier time than that event which really corresponds to it, Luke vii. 1 sq. See below.

[2] It appears of itself from this that the whole section of John that belongs

bashful commencement onwards so perfectly the right one, that nothing better, nobler, or more directly progressive, can be conceived.

The length of this initiatory period cannot be very exactly determined: it is certain that it was not more than a year. A tradition states that the labours of Jesus commenced in the spring;[1] but the tradition is probably connected with the erroneous notion referred to above,[2] that his whole public work occupied but one year.

1. *The first solicitations of his Messianic power in judgment and speech.*

True power, or capability, never puts itself forward gratuitously, least of all at the beginning and before it has been compelled to get perfectly acquainted with its own resources: it is rather shy and reserved, without the slightest presumption, and as it were still self-distrustful, until it is from without unexpectedly called to exert itself by what seems a good and irresistible appeal. And this holds in every respect, and in the first instance as regards even intuitive judgment, prophetic foresight, and powerful speech. For undoubtedly the power of the true Christ must also, and indeed primarily, manifest itself by both the glance that penetrates the inmost souls of men and prophetically forms the truest judgment of them, and by the swift unerring word corresponding thereto.

An occasion for this manifestation was presented soon after the baptism of Jesus.[3] He still tarried in the neighbourhood of the Baptist; and if the latter only saw him appearing and walking in the distance, the sight of him always aroused in him the same feelings as were above described,[4] and he always broke out in the same terms of profound admiration and expectation. As now he once spoke thus about Jesus as he

here divides itself into the following subsections: (1) i. 35–52, and, as the second half of it, ii. 1–12; (2) ii. 13–iii. 21, and, as the second larger half of it, iii. 22–iv. 42; (3) iv. 43–54. Within these divisions the various matter is further appropriately divided in various ways. And it is certainly worth the trouble, and is indeed necessary, to rediscover the course of progress in all the details; comp. thereon also *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. p. 109.

[1] Clem. *Hom.* i. 6.

[2] Pp. 151 sq.

[3] The true meaning of the transitional phrases *the next day*, John i. 35 (29), 44, vi. 22, xii. 12, and *on the third day*, ii. 1, is, indeed, not doubtful, but whoever is more closely acquainted with the style of narration observed by this Gospel, will not be inclined to doubt that they are really nothing more than suitable transitional phrases, and need not necessarily be slavishly understood in every passage. Particularly in this most remote initiatory period, to recall which accurately was at so late a time very difficult, such notes of time are certainly intended only to indicate approximations to the exact fact.

[4] Pp. 192 sq.

passed by while two of his disciples, who happened also to be from Galilee, were standing near, a strong desire seized them, the more as they were Galileans, to approach the man that had been thus marked out by the Baptist. They went after him, but when he turned round to them and kindly asked what they desired, they could not at this first moment, as somewhat confused, say anything else than that they wished to learn where the 'Master' (*Rabbi*) had his dwelling in those parts. With the simple reply, 'come and ye will see,' he invited them to follow him to the place. They followed him thither, were at once profoundly enchained by his conversation, his doctrine, and his whole person, and remained, without noting how the time went, over the night with him, although it was morning when they entered his dwelling.[1] Indeed they were from these very hours so completely convinced that he was the Messiah, that one of them was the next morning still unwilling to leave him, whilst the other, whose name was Andrew, went to seek his brother Simon,[2] communicated to him when he had met with him his new joy at having found the Messiah, and indeed forthwith brought him likewise to Jesus. And Jesus had scarcely cast an earnest glance at him, when he at once perceived in him the extraordinary sturdy firmness, the tenacious force of soul, and the rapid decisiveness which remained subsequently characteristic of him to his death; and the rising king and ruler had found in him his servant and confessor who would prove himself firm as a rock, the man who would never again be really unfaithful to him from this moment, even amid the greatest alternations and commotions of his own soul and the growing storms and violent assaults of the world. It is not surprising that Christ now called him forthwith a 'Rock,' and that ever after this word, often repeated by Christ and soon used as frequently by others, became his surname Cephas, which, afterwards translated into Greek as Peter, at last threw his previous name into the shade and became one of the most honoured names in the new Community. When a wholly new spiritual society, indeed, a new church is about to be formed, new names also naturally arise, whether or not the origin of any particular one is at first quite accidental: we see

[1] The tenth hour John i. 40: that is, from xix. 14, comp. xviii. 28, it follows absolutely that this Apostle reckons the hours of the day exactly as we do now, quite departing from the mode of reckoning in the other Gospels, in Josephus (who in his *Life*, ch. liv., also reckons as elsewhere), and in Philo (*Opera*, i. pp. 692 sq., 41 sq.); it readily appears from the connection of each passage whether the morning hours, as here and xix. 14, or the evening hours, as iv. 6, 52, are intended.

[2] This is rather plainly indicated by πρῶτος, ver. 42, he *first*, because he first went away to bring another.

this happening here, only the instance is a most illustrious one.[1]

Who the other one of the two that first sought Jesus was the Apostle John does not tell us: but this is undoubtedly owing to the same modesty and sweet reserve which everywhere else in his writings leads this finely organised soul to indicate so delicately as to be only just perceptible his unique personal relation to him, and never to boast and speak loudly of it. Incontestably it was he himself, with Andrew, who as a disciple of the Baptist first sought Jesus, but at the first meeting with him was so enchained by his royal soul that he stayed with no one so gladly as with him, in delicious enthusiasm as it were forgot himself in his society, and never again departed for long from his side. He does not tell us further by what progressive steps from this first moment his faith grew and his love to the Saviour received that inexpressible charm which raised him above all mere faith and made him in so far through his whole life to his late death the most peerless disciple of the Lord. But he cannot be blamed that in his history he causes at least the first moment to shine through the veil of his narrative, the moment when he, who wrote and lived last, came with Andrew into the society of Christ first before any others. It is only quite at the end of this highest earthly history that he once more suffers a few similar traits of his special relation to Christ to appear: the issue, indeed, can only most plainly develop and strongly confirm a relation that had here at the commencement been so magically established.

In the earlier documents also, John and James (the latter being the elder, as he is always named first),[2] the sons of Zebedee, sprung from a well-to-do family, and moreover related to Christ, are constantly, together with Simon and Andrew, described as the earliest disciples of Christ.[3] We see how firmly this foundation of all the reminiscences of the initiatory period was established; and if in the common narrative Peter, with his brother, is always mentioned first, this is explained by his rank in other respects, no less readily than the fact that John in his special Gospel does not mention James either in this section of it or elsewhere; for the delicacy of his feeling and the reserve of

[1] Comp. vol. ii. pp. 155, 236. Subsequently the existence of the name is really already presupposed Matt. xvi. 18. This renaming occurs again in the Apostolic age, Acts iv. 36.

[2] Both of which facts may be inferred from the indications mentioned above, p. 181.

[3] Mark i. 14–20 (Matt. and Luke).

his language extended even so far as this, as well as to all other relations.[1] These four first-fruits of grace had also this in common, that they belonged to two fisher families in easy circumstances, dwelling by the Lake of Galilee; indeed, all four were really from the same town of Bethsaida.[2] And if the calling of these two pairs of brothers is in the earlier documents transferred to Galilee and the Lake of Gennesareth, that is connected with the general plan and arrangement of this earlier class of narration, according to which the public appearance of Jesus did not take place until a somewhat later time. Moreover, in fact, the closer and more unbroken intercourse of these four first Apostles with Christ cannot have been fully formed all at once; we shall subsequently see when and why it developed into more unbroken intimacy. When he subsequently received these four into his closest fellowship, to live with him constantly and in closest intimacy, and thereby distinguished them from all others who had as yet stood in somewhat close relations with him, he may, in a natural allusion to their former occupation as fishermen, which they were now to forsake, have used that happy figure, that henceforth he would make them fishers of men. This figure, with the deeper thought which it conveyed, was perfectly appropriate to that time.

But for the present the relation between the 'Master' (Rabbi) and the disciples who were to come into closer intimacy with him was somewhat less decided. It may, however, be inferred from the nature of the case,[3] that the three above-named (or probably four, with James) accompanied him on his return to Galilee, which soon followed; and as on the day of commencing the journey home he met with Philip, it needed but a word on his part to convert this fellow-townsman of the first three into an attendant. Thus the fourth (or fifth) of those who subsequently formed the band of the Twelve was brought to accompany him.

The homeward journey was, as we have already remarked, to Cana in Galilee.[4] But during that journey[5] Philip had

[1] See *Jahrbb. der B. W.*, iii. p. 170 [now *Die drei ersten Evang.*, i. pp. 129 sq.]; comp. also *ibid.* v. pp. 279, 295 sq.

[2] John i. 45, xii. 21, comp. with Luke v. 10.

[3] But is also implied in the words, '*we* have found,' in the mouth of Philip, John i. 46.

[4] P. 180.

[5] That is, between ver. 45 and ver. 46 we must suppose this homeward journey; this is implied by the nature of the case, and is confirmed by John xxi. 2, according to which Nathanael belonged to Cana; and that the homeward journey was in the first instance prosecuted only as far as Cana, where Jesus remained for some time, may be inferred not only from the considerations mentioned above, p. 180, but also from the fact of its being Nathanael's residence, John xxi. 2. The *third day*, ii. 1, must plainly be counted from the first day of the arrival at Cana.

already so fully perceived the truth of Christ, that no sooner had he arrived at Cana than he sought his friend Nathanael, declared to him with great enthusiasm that he with his friends had found 'him of whom Moses in the Law and the Prophets had written,' and met the incredulity of Nathanael, as it broke out in the question, 'From Nazareth (that small unknown village), can any good thing come?' by the challenge that he should himself come and see. As Jesus saw him coming to him he uttered, as if only for others to hear, the exclamation, 'See, there is coming a true Israelite, in whom is no guile!' inasmuch as Jesus had shortly before, in passing by unobserved, discerned in him at the first glance a guilelessness and straightforwardness of soul such as every member of the true Community of God ought to have.[1] But, surprised at the deeper truth of this utterance, which he nevertheless heard quite well, the coming inquirer replies at the moment with the question, whence Jesus knew him? And as Jesus answers, 'Before Philip called thee, I saw thee as thou wast under the fig-tree!' he recollects no less quickly the profound and serious thoughts with which he had just been occupied as he sat under the fig-tree by his house[2] and supposed himself alone under the covering of its branches, and now, answering to the truth of that first word, sees the depths of his soul also suddenly and mysteriously revealed clearly to the mental eye of Jesus, and prostrates himself before the Master with the most sincere confession of faith in him as 'the Son of God and King of Israel.' The first word had immediately struck home; the reference to the moment which he had shortly before passed through, when, supposing himself to be alone, he had perhaps been thinking of the misery of Israel, full of longing, and was seen and correctly estimated unknown to him by the Master, rapidly completed his faith. Yet it is not this first enthusiastic impulse that can satisfy the Christ: he therefore points Nathanael, and all who are present, as with surprise, to the fact, that if he already believes because he sees that he was, un-

[1] It may here be incidentally remarked that the meaning of the utterance ver. 48 must not, at all events originally, be sought in the word תֹּם, Gen. xxv. 27, although the LXX render it by ἄπλαστος: according to the connection, this Hebrew word must signify *quiet* or *peace*, which is elsewhere expressed by the softer sounds דֹּם [comp. *History of Israel*, i. 352].

[2] '*The* fig-tree,' vv. 49, 51, thus briefly and thus definitely spoken of, can only be that well-known one which was often found near houses, as in other cases vines covered the houses of those parts. The ancient phrase in Joel–Mic. iv. 4 [see *Prophets of the Old Testament*, i. p. 114] refers to this festooning of the houses, which had been usual in Palestine from early times. It is not implied in the narrative that Jesus had not really seen him.

known to himself, recognised under the fig-tree, they would all soon find quite other reasons for believing in him, would see 'the heaven open and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.' For as soon as the Messiah begins his full work with all his celestial powers, this far higher scene is presented, clearly to be perceived by everyone that is willing to perceive it, and most clearly to be fully viewed from its end when it has been finished; as the Apostle who supplies these brief outlines recalling the earliest commencement of the public work of Jesus, had learnt always to look back from the glory of the end upon all this which had once been seen by him with infinite rapture.

Thus unlooked for and yet thus necessarily has the exercise of the genuinely Messianic perception of the deep things of men, and of the enchainment of them by the true glance and the right word, been presented to Jesus: and already he is fully occupied with this part of his work. Who this Nathanael was appears to us at first somewhat obscure, as the name is found in this book only; yet he is undoubtedly regarded as being a prominent man amongst the first confessors of Christ, as, indeed, he appears once more elsewhere in this book in such a way that we must consider him one of the Twelve.[1] As now in the ancient list of the Apostles Bartholomew always immediately follows Philip,[2] we are fully justified in regarding him as the same Apostle; in that case John would have preserved his real name, but the list of the Apostles that which was customary in common life.

The Messianic activity in deeds of power and mercy.

For thus also the true Messianic work was now to begin, wholly unsought for; indeed, almost against his will, and yet no less in obedience to higher necessity. On the third day (after the return to Cana), the narrative proceeds, there was at that place a marriage to which the mother of Jesus, as well as himself and his disciples, was invited. His mother had probably observed more plainly than anyone else the change which had in the meantime taken place in him; she probably accordingly also looked up to him as the Messiah even more expectantly than the few disciples that he had now found; and as

[1] John xxi. 2.

[2] The fact that Luke, Acts i. 13 only, places him one place lower has no great significance as against the other indications. The name of his father was Θολομαῖος, Jos. *Ant.* xx. 1. 1, corresponding to the genuinely Aramaic תַּלְמַי.

at the wedding, which was attended by so many people, the wine had run short, she says to him, 'They have no wine!' as if she wished to intimate how suitable it would be if he were to come to their assistance in this case of unexpected deficiency, particularly, indeed, as he himself, with his unexpected following of disciples, had been invited. At first, however, he is surprised at this suggestion of his mother, and refuses her desire, because 'his hour is not yet come'; but she adheres to her strong belief that it is, and desires the servants to do whatever Jesus may tell them. Accordingly, it is precisely this maternal faith which suddenly compels the power that slumbers within him for the first time fully to reveal itself. On this very occasion a certain shyness still kept him back from acting and helping; just now he still felt that his hour was not yet come, but suddenly it is there; and the water which is poured at his command into six great water jugs, that are at hand for washing the hands before or after the meals,[1] is changed at his will into wine, and such good wine that the governor of the feast himself involuntarily pronounces it better than the first.

This first miraculous work of Christ appears thus in every respect as a true initiatory work, and is precisely in this respect so peculiarly instructive. It occurs in the midst of a joyous season that is sometimes unrestrained, as in the sportive side of life, and yet it is sufficiently great and serious; even in the midst of life's pleasures in which he with his disciples takes unaffectedly a part, he preserves all due restraint and seriousness. The deed itself corresponds to the unusually joyous season both of this domestic festivity and of the commencing Messianic work: to change water into wine is at other times none of the ordinary miraculous works of the primitive Christian age, yet in this case it is like a joyous donation for the commencement of the entire royal life-work that is now in prospect, as also other kings gladden the people by distributing wine on the happy days of their consecration. But in this case it is a wholly different king who is just beginning to enter upon his kingdom in the exercise of his powers; in this case there is no outward preparation, no worldly wealth and private worldly stores which this new king is able or desirous to distribute. He has no wine, and yet he has it: the water itself becomes the best wine under the influence of his spirit; it is not his intention to

[1] With the words John ii. 6 comp. Mark vii. 3, 4, whence it appears that these great jugs might stand at hand empty during the feast. But the moment of the transformation, i.e. of the effective blessing, is manifestly meant to be that of the drawing, presentation and drinking of it under the blessing of Christ.

procure it in order thereby also to celebrate this day, and yet receives it almost unsought for—indeed, almost against his will —at the right time for such a celebration.[1] If we wished here to inquire in a gross sense how mere water could possibly in a moment become wine, we should sadly dilute for ourselves this wine, which from that time can still always flow for us also. Shall then, water, in the best sense of the word, not everywhere now also become wine where Christ's spirit is operative in all its power? Undoubtedly this aspect of the Apostolic and Christian view of the matter might also have been here at length and intentionally touched upon; in other places our Apostle does not omit to do this.[2] But here, in connection with this first work, which he describes somewhat more particularly as an example, the point of chief importance with him is to give prominence to the proper commencement of the Messianic work; and in this respect the narrative, notwithstanding its brevity, is sufficiently plain and instructive. No good, prosperous, beneficent work arises at the solely human desire, instigation, and persistence of the worker himself, least of all an initiatory work; reserve and a delicate shyness, quiet waiting and patience, until, unobserved, at the right moment, the Spirit itself comes urgently with its full force, is in such a case a first higher command. But how grandly, and with what marvellous power, can this spirit itself operate if it comes thus in the right way and at the right moment! It then effects infinitely more than the man himself intended but a little while before, and dispenses powers and blessings which surpass everything that the modest mind itself had just before expected. Moreover, the friendly faith from without, responding to that within, and encouraging it in its beneficent work, is in such matters the beginning of the miraculous itself. If this holds in all such cases, it holds most of all, and most clearly, in the case of the Messiah; and if everywhere the first great beneficent work is the most difficult, appearing beforehand almost impossible, so that in its case the just divine shyness and reserve must most of all meet with the proper faith from all sides, that was also the case with the first Messianic work. The maternal faith at an unexpectedly appropriate moment met him to call forth the right work, rousing and encouraging him; so the whole power of the Messianic spirit, as it slumbered concealed within him, suddenly came forth in his soul, never again (when it had once been aroused in the right way and at the right time to a beneficent work) to

[1] δόξα, John ii. 11.

[2] Comp. the author's commentary on this miracle, *Johanneische Schriften*, vol. i., particularly pp. 150 sq.—Tr.

lay aside its activity and works of beneficence, but to prosecute the Messianic life-work thus commenced, without cessation or weariness, to its own highest goal. This is the meaning, in its most characteristic nature, of the first piece of narrative of this kind in John; and, as is naturally to be expected from him, precisely this narrative of the first Messianic miracle has thereby in his Gospel something much more instructive, which goes deeper into the infinite nature of this whole history, than the corresponding narratives in the other Gospels.

2. *His first public appearance and labours, and the beginning of his acknowledgment in various directions.*

However, he did not continue to reside very long with his mother, brothers, and disciples in Cana; the family removed to *Kaphar-Nahûm* (i.e., Nahum's village), or Capernaum, on the western shore of the Lake of Galilee,[1] where from that time we find it permanently residing, and where Peter and Andrew dwelt also, both of them in the house of the mother-in-law of the former.[2] It thus seems that in Capernaum were collected several families having friendly relations with each other. And not far from this place lay two others of importance in this history: *Bethsaida*, situated by the Lake, the very name signifying *Fish-house*, and, as we have seen,[3] distinct enough from the other Bethsaida, situated to the north of the Lake;[4] and, pro-

[1] Now (as has been supposed by many in recent times) the ruins of Tell Hûm, on the north-west of the Lake, in which case כפר would be shortened from Nahûm. The recent conjectures regarding these towns in de Saulcy's *Travels*, ii. pp. 491 sq., appear to have little foundation; comp. now [i.e. date of 3rd ed. 1867] the *Revue archéol.* 1863, i. pp. 22, 166–83. In his *Neueren Forschungen*, pp. 456–70 [*Bibl. Res.* 2nd ed. iii. pp. 348–358] Robinson defends his previous opinion, based mainly on Quæresmius, that Capernaum was the place now called *Khân Minjeh*, further to the south of Tell Hûm; but whether this necessarily follows from Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10, 8, and *Life*, ch. lxxii., will be discussed in vol. vi. of this work [p. 713.] The attempt to identify this *Minjeh* with Capernaum, because the people of Capernaum appeared to the Rabbis especially as מינים, i.e. Christians (comp. vol. vii. p. 64) [German], might seem the more doubtful as that name has rather an Egyptian sound. Nevertheless there are many weighty arguments in favour of its being further to the south than Tell Hûm, that is, where the Khan Minyeh is now situated; and as the Palestine Exploration Society is just now [1867] directing its attention particularly to that so long neglected corner of the Galilean Lake, we may hope that the excavations made there will soon kindle a more satisfactory light on this subject. In any case, we must think of Capernaum as lying as near as possible to Bethsaida and Chorazin, as follows from the passages above referred to; but on this point see further below. [The researches of the Exploration Society did not result in the discovery of positive evidence fixing decisively the locality of the cities Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin. But Captain Wilson pronounces in favour of Tell Hûm for site of Capernaum, places Chorazin at Kerazeh, and the Bethsaida of Galilee, if distinct from Bethsaida Julias, at Khan Minjeh.]

[2] According to Mark i. 29–31, Matt. xvii. 24, and other passages; see below.

[3] P. 72.

[4] Comp. as regards the two Bethsaidas and Mark viii. 22, 23, the further remarks below. If there had been but one Bethsaida, the addition τῆς Γαλιλαίας, John

bably somewhat to the north-west, further inland, *Chorazin*, of which it has been to the present time difficult to find a trace.[1] Somewhat further south, on the same side of the Lake, lay also the ancient *Magdala*, from which Mary Magdalene[2] derived her surname.

Within the circuit of these three towns, Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin, which were undoubtedly very close together, the first Messianic labours of Christ, according to all that we can now discover with certainty, found their sphere. It was a restricted sphere in which they were first put forth, but the basis upon which they were first gradually commenced was all the more secure, and the higher experience which could be obtained in this sphere was all the more instructive. It is true that this very experience which the three towns supplied was not encouraging, although Jesus devoted to them especially this first bloom of his general activity which was now bursting forth so mightily; in later utterances this bitter recollection makes itself plainly enough heard,[3] as it was indeed but little relieved by the experience of the subsequent times.

xii. 21, would have been quite superfluous. Seetzen (*Reisen*, i. pp. 124, 344 sq.) specified two Bethsaidas in this district as distinctly mentioned by a trustworthy resident; but hitherto no one after him has more particularly examined this assertion, nor found plain traces of a western Bethsaida. The Bethsaida to the north did not lie on the shore, as is presupposed Mark vi. 45, but further inland. And as Tiberias was never visited by Christ and his disciples (see *ante*, p. 76), so also the northern Bethsaida, which had been converted into a more heathen Julias (see *ante*, p. 72) appears to have lain out of their way. But the Bethsaida of the Gospels, according to all the indications which will meet us below, was situated to the north-west of the Sea; and so it is possible that the village which had been converted into the town Julias bore the same name (Bethsaida) as situated in the same ancient territory.

[1] It appears also, according to more recent travellers, that the ruins of a place Chorazin have been lost; yet in the year 1217 Thietmarus still heard in this neighbourhood of a place with substantially [Corrosaya] the same name (see *Jahrbb. der B. W.* iv. p. 31). A Chorazin *east* of the Lake, according to Seetzen (*Reisen*, i. p. 345), is certainly quite out of the question; but a Kerazeh, كرزة, which, as far as regards the orthography, may be the same, has been in more recent times so definitely discovered by Richardson, Keith and Trupp (see Van de Velde's *Narrative*, ii. p. 396, and *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. pp. 143 sq.), and then by Robinson also (*Bibl. Res.* iii. pp. 346 sq.), north-west of Tell Hûm, that we cannot do wrong in supposing it to be Chorazin. On the other hand, Robinson is mistaken with regard to this Kerazeh, and seeks, without any evident reason, to place Chorazin at Tell Hûm. For the statements of the ancients in the *Onomasticon*, that Chorazin also was situated by the Lake, must not be taken so literally. The statements of the Middle Ages with regard to these places see in Laurent's *Peregrinatores Quatuor*, pp. 36 sq., 147 sq., and in Tobler's edition of *Theodoricus*, pp. 40, 101.

[2] See *ante*, p. 223.

[3] That is, the passage from the Collected Sayings Matt. xi. 20–24, Luke x. 13–15, where alone the name Chorazin is now found, alludes very plainly to experiences which are no longer perceptibly presented in Mark, in accordance with the manner and arrangement of his narrations, and which quite bear the marks of being a brief but purely historical reminiscence of this earliest period, particularly as regards Bethsaida and Chorazin; this appears the more certain when we compare them with the almost equally short but not less genuine historical reminiscence, John iv. 43–45 [comp. *ante*, p. 242], which, moreover, is quite independent of the reminiscence of the Collected Sayings.

But on this account he was the more induced to make known his real claims and character quite publicly beyond this more limited circle, and now precisely in the principal place of the time. For this purpose it was Jerusalem and the Temple, with its numerous teachers' courts and other advantages, which presented the suitable place; and if he sought to be really acknowledged as the Messiah, he must from this exalted centre publicly show as soon as possible that he was the Messiah, and what kind of Messiah he claimed to be. That north-western corner on the shores of the Lake of Galilee,[1] or, indeed, Galilee generally, was not of itself sufficiently well adapted for his purpose; and though this province, as we shall see more at length below, possessed many advantages which Jerusalem itself did not present, it still looked with self-diffidence and expectantly to Jerusalem in everything that referred to religion and government. Jesus would now have probably in any case undertaken the usual visit to the feast at Jerusalem; but that he found no proper acknowledgment, in spite of his Messianic words and deeds, in the first limited sphere, formed an additional reason for determining to undertake the journey to the feast at Jerusalem as early as possible, that is, at the very next Passover.[2]

In connection with this his first stay in Jerusalem, it is just one deed which the Apostle gives prominence to as significant and describes at length. He certainly did not go with the distinct purpose of outwardly purifying the Temple; but as he there became a spectator of the desecrating abuse which was made of the sacred site and building simply from motives of gain and convenience, the Messianic zeal, which had already become dominant within him, overpowered him, and with irresistible force he expelled the vendors of sacrificial animals, with the animals themselves, from the forecourt of the Temple, making use of a thong extemporised from cords, overturned the tables of the money-changers, who had planted themselves there,[3] and

[1] Immediately south of the corner where those three towns were situated lies the small extremely fruitful district which, according to Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 10. 8, was called Gennesar, and which is at present called in Arabic Ghuvair (the little Ghor, or plain); it undoubtedly derived its name from a great town of very ancient times which was once situated there, the name of which can have been orthographically only slightly different from גִּנֶּסֶר (vol ii. pp. 290 sq., note), and which was accordingly first so named from the Lake. This district is the *land Gennesaret* Mark vi. 53 (Matt. xiv. 34); and if a spring in it bore the name of Kapharnahum, as Josephus states, this is an additional reason for inferring that the town Kapharnaum also was situated within this plain.

[2] According to John ii. 12, 13; iv. 43–45, also 46–54.

[3] Probably because, according to ancient custom, nothing belonging to the Temple could be paid for with any other than national money, while at the time of Christ foreign money was so much in use.

forbad that such vessels as did not belong to the Temple service should be carried in and out of it.[1] Such a desecration of sacred places is certainly everywhere easily possible, has also often been repeated in Christian lands, and is not infrequently favoured by the indolence or even the covetousness of priests; but nowhere was it less to be suffered than in that sanctuary which was intended to be regarded as of its kind without a rival, and to serve the true religion alone. And every godly man may naturally be filled with indignant zeal at such abuse, so that it is hard to say how the individual who feels himself mightily moved to put an end to a wicked disorder of this kind can really be punished; but before all other men the Messiah may, and indeed must, feel called upon when the occasion is presented thus to end it. It is quite true that he has many other and greater things to purify and reform; yet he must not despise the work of purifying the smaller things, if the occasion for doing so demands it so immediately and so irresistibly as was then the case; and especially when he is generally but at the beginning of his whole higher labours, may he not disdain the smaller tasks, inasmuch as they then become of themselves the sign and commencement of much greater purifications.[2]

So this unexpected and surprising deed had not been intended, or perforce invented, according to some ingenious plan, but it was appropriate in its place and significant at its time; not easily to be undertaken by anyone whatever, still less to be successfully accomplished; but having been suddenly attempted by the heroism of his zeal, it was also carried out with his irresistible heroic strength. In performing it he himself appealed to nothing but certain appropriate texts from the

[1] The last detail is not found in the description of the incident John ii. 13–22, which is in other respects more complete and definite, but in the earlier description Mark xi. 15–18 (Matt. Luke); but it is in itself so suitable that it may be here adopted.

[2] This is at the same time the true reason for concluding that John places the purification of the Temple much more appropriately quite at the beginning than with Mark (Matt. Luke) at the end of the public labours of Christ. At the end the act would have altogether a purely symbolical significance, inasmuch as he had long before been engaged in much more important purifications, and would, moreover, at the end unnecessarily provoke the hierarchy; whilst for the beginning the act is of itself important enough, moreover gives vent to the full fire of his first zeal, and, strong as it is, it is nevertheless not too strong nor needlessly provocative. It is easy to perceive that the act could not be repeated, occurring both at the beginning and at the end: by repetition it would lose its significance and expressiveness in the same way as the rite of baptism would in the case of ordinary men, comp. *ante*, p. 169. The reception of the narrative, according to the earlier form of the story, into the series of Christ's deeds at Jerusalem shortly before his death can be explained from the origin of that earlier form of narrative, inasmuch as it brought together once only into one series everything that could be remembered of Christ's doings at Jerusalem.

Bible;[1] and his disciples, although at the first glance astonished at his unexpected conduct, could easily reassure themselves by recalling similar passages from the Bible.[2] Neither could the priests and guardians of the Temple do more than ask why he especially dared to undertake such things? and what special justification for so doing he had to show? And accordingly they really asked him, as John states, what sign (from God), or what special divine attestation and warrant, he could show in that he did such things? But this question reminded him in fact not merely of his own authority as the Messiah, but also likewise, and in the end still more, of the just basis of the entire condition of things at that moment; and those who put this question ought previously to have asked themselves, whence their own feebleness in presence of such a desecration of the sanctuary came, and whether there was anyone else than the Messiah who could cleanse this sanctuary, not merely partially and temporarily, but perfectly and for ever. Accordingly, he directs an answer to them which might surprise them, if possible, still more than that deed itself: 'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up again'![3] still continuing, as was necessary, to speak of the Temple, but immediately making a transition to something infinitely higher, as was likewise necessary in order to silence them. 'Your whole religion as it is based upon this Temple is corrupt and perverse, but already *he* is present who, when it perishes, as perish it must, can easily restore it in infinitely greater glory, and thereby perform not merely an ordinary miracle such as ye require, but the highest miracle itself!' This is what he really proclaimed to them in that enigmatical utterance, which he was on other occasions accustomed to use, at once surpassing their low thoughts and aims by substituting the highest ones, which were alone of essential moment, and raising the lower contention out of the dust of this earth into its celestial elevation and eternal meaning. Do ye really desire a sign from me with reference to my divine authority over the Temple? Very well,

[1] 'Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise,' John ii. 16, is an excellent paraphrase in John's characteristic manner of the more original words in Mark xi. 17.

[2] As is so well stated John ii. 17, comp. Ps. lxix. 10.

[3] It needs no comment to show that the *same* Temple which he had begun to purify cannot be raised up again in the material sense; it may therefore easily be inferred how the *αὐτόν* is to be understood. And yet this form of the utterance, as more pointed, enigmatical, and nevertheless more spiritual, is certainly much more original and authentic than the other in which the enemies of Jesus presented it for evil purposes, Matt. xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40; comp. Mark xiv. 58, Acts vi. 12–15. Such high enigmatical utterances, as this example also teaches, reappear in the most various forms; but it is really not difficult to discover the most original one.

ye shall have the highest that ye could possibly require and expect: destroy this Temple, this Temple which as long as it stands I desire to have cleansed and made worthy of its object, but which after all will surely some day fall: destroy it even if ye will and fling away therewith all your wrong religion, I tell you that in a short time I will build it up again, and infinitely more glorious than this visible, much disfigured one is, the eternal and indestructible Temple. It is true it immediately appears how little they were able to reply to his answer, and that they preferred to understand in a material sense his most sublime spiritual utterances,[1] indeed, tried as best they could to overcome him by ridicule; but in that case they were obliged to leave him alone whose challenge they did not accept and whose marvellous enigma they could not solve.

If that deed was surprising, how much more so is this answer, to which the priests have no reply. There lies in it the infinite prophecy of all the future; he has already in mind the true indestructible Temple, just as he will again refer to it at the end of his earthly labours. And if all fire and zeal when it can break forth and freely express itself the first time is very naturally most forcible and overpowering, so also are this deed and this utterance. In fact, this utterance is extremely bold and cutting, and so enigmatically lofty that we need not be surprised at the various misconceptions to which it gave rise. We shall see subsequently how long it continued to ring in the ears of his enemies, although it was soon variously distorted and at last made use of for the final fatal accusation against the bold speaker; indeed, how after the death of the innocent man it had to serve as the basis of the mortal calumniation of his most faithful followers.[2] The issue of this history is thus closely connected with its beginning, just as it is found in the case of all great developments that their final stage is involved in their first. That splendid Temple of peerless sanctity was very soon destroyed, most of all through the fault of those who sought most carefully to preserve it with all its abuses; and wonderful to say, almost before it perished, and not subsequent to its outward destruction, unobserved by the age, another of an imperishable nature had already been silently erected in its place. Yet he who first and at the very beginning of his course proclaimed this in enigmatical prophecy, and built this new incomparably enduring Temple, fell an offering to the

[1] See another aspect of these words, ii. 20, *ante*, pp. 153 sq.

[2] In the case of Stephen, Acts ch. vi. 8–ch. vii.; comp. vol. vi. [German].

truth of this enigmatical utterance as it was deliberately distorted; and then the truth which might lie in his prophetic utterance was at the time at once fulfilled in another, much more immediately palpable, manner. The still more wonderful and more glorious Temple of his own body[1] was then destroyed by his enemies, and yet restored again by him after three days. It is not surprising that John with other disciples gave to the truth of this utterance this application also, or indeed by preference this application especially.[2] As a reply to his enemies it has almost as much meaning, indeed for those first times of the Apostles a much more immediate meaning, as in fact this interpretation of the Master's saying amongst the Apostles undoubtedly arose at the time when the Temple was still standing, and must from that time forth have remained so fixed in the mind of John that he repeats it even in times when the Temple had already been destroyed and the freer and higher interpretation of the utterance would thereby have been much easier. But we who can now take a much freer view of all this, must in this case also turn to the strict meaning of the whole history and to the full sublimity of the utterance and the deed of Christ, while at the same time we thank the Apostle that he has preserved for us the utterance in its original bold elevation.

As Jesus by many such words and deeds, the wonderful force and effect of which may be perceived from the examples just given, aroused general attention at the great centre of the nation in Jerusalem, the fact that many now began to believe on him is quite intelligible: but it might appear surprising that he received no one into the immediate circle of his disciples from the numerous inhabitants of the city, and particularly no one from the ranks of the great scholars and men of reputation who were gathered together there, and although many 'trusted (believed) in him,' he still did not trust himself to any of them in the same way as he received at least some of the well-known Galileans into his closer confidence. But what we see in this case occurred again and again subsequently; it must therefore have a more general cause, and a cause which

[1] The comparison of the human body with an easily removed tent, or even with a finely constructed temple, is elsewhere not infrequent, after the bold image in the elegy of Hezekiah, 'Isa.' xxxviii. 12 (where, however, the correct translation is *mine age* דּוֹר, כפר *has been pulled down and rolled up* like a tent already pulled down, and will thus *depart from me*), as 2 Cor. v. 1 sq.

[2] John ii. 21, 22. The fact that the utterance is not found at all in the other Evangelists is probably connected therewith; in that case it was placed amongst the similar prophecies of his resurrection with which they abound.

is not very difficult to find. The Galileans naturally stood in every respect in closer relationship to him; and if he desired a greater intimacy with any he found it sufficiently amongst them, at all events amongst a few of them, since in such a case numbers are not at all necessary. The men of Jerusalem, on the other hand (as is generally the case with the inhabitants of capital cities), were, in comparison with the more simple country people, generally a populace prone to curiosity and love of innovations rather than profoundly in earnest; and the ancient scholastic philosophy and learning that flourished there was, as we have seen,[1] of a character little fitted to really understand him and to adhere closely to him, as the result will in general show. The penetrating glance of Jesus perceived all this quite clearly from the very beginning: and, moreover, he in fact stood in no need whatever of human supporters and helpers who had been sought and retained with difficulty. Probably there were many amongst the men of repute and influence in Jerusalem who felt dimly the defects of the dominant scholastic philosophy and the Hagiocracy, and were, moreover, unable to rejoice in either the Herodean or the Roman rule, who would therefore have perhaps been inclined to adhere to a genuine king of Israel, and who indeed privately admired Christ, and were prepared to acknowledge him if that course had seemed to them sufficiently safe. But that Apostle who, although in his Gospel he supplements the others with so much from Jerusalem, was still primarily conscious of being a Galilean, and knew well that Jesus had made Galileans only his most intimate friends,[2] observes, on this occasion particularly, that Jesus did not trust himself to the men of Jerusalem, '*because he knew all men, and because he had no need that any one should bear witness concerning the man*'—that is, concerning him as man[3] (for a glad witness concerning him as Son of God, if it came voluntarily, he did not disdain), *since he well knew what was in the man*, whether the man desired to do homage to him

[1] *Ante*, pp. 88 sq.

[2] Whoever has made himself intimately acquainted with the fourth Gospel will also on that account believe in its origin from the Apostle, that it enables the reader to feel in it even those things which at first sight would not at all have been expected from it—for instance, a distinct consciousness that Galileans only could be the truly intimate friends of Christ. No Gospel appears to be less Galilean than this, and is more so on the really decisive point.

[3] περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, John ii. 25 must refer in the first instance to Christ, amongst other reasons on account of the similarity of the thought with v. 34; comp. also viii. 40. According to these words, therefore, there are essentially two different reasons why he did not trust himself to them: because he knew them, namely, that their faith had not the requisite depth; and, secondly, because he had no need to court their witness and acknowledgment. The language, as is often the case with John, is extremely concise.

as a human king simply on account of his remarkable works and miracles, and expected from him a human Messianic kingdom or not. Whoever seeks in the ordinary way to reign amongst men, must look about for influential men who, suitably to the views of men, praise and recommend him after the human fashion—that is, from temporal motives, because they have their own human welfare in view, and such influential men can become his immediate advisers, helpers, and servants, that they may extend and preserve his kingdom, which is not founded upon eternal truth. Such *he* did not seek, neither did he stand in need of them.

Nevertheless a Pharisee of the name of Nicodemus,[1] a man of repute, rich, and a member of the Synedrion, appeared about to form an exception from the general holding aloof of the chief people of Jerusalem. He was struck by the great deeds of Jesus, and exhibited some desire to place himself in a more confidential relation to him as in reality the Messiah, in order that he might in due time fathom what seemed to him such an important mystery of the age, or perhaps that he might also offer him his assistance as first friend and adviser, although at first only privately. So he came to Jesus at night, and commenced a confidential conversation with him; he had really a desire 'to see the kingdom of God,' and himself to participate in it, and sought therefore to learn, as it were, the ultimate conditions of it, and how Jesus proposed to bring it about. We cannot doubt the historical character of this more serious leaning towards Jesus and his undertaking on the part of such a man: he was really also strengthened in his faith by the confidential intercourse with him, and shows subsequently also, as far as it seemed to him safe, somewhat openly his more serious sympathy:[2] only that he in his position as a man of repute and a member of the council in Jerusalem, has no wish to become such a disciple as the Twelve and others like them were, as also Jesus, when he declares to him the full truth, makes no further effort whatever to attract him to himself. He remained thus a secret admirer, not reflecting that, in view of the plain truths and duties of his time, secret respect and

[1] The Talmudic legends of the rich *Neqdîmon*, who is said to have survived the destruction of Jerusalem, and to have had also the Hebrew name of *Bunni*, are not without significance with reference to the question of the historical existence of our Nicodemus, but they are too vague to permit us to learn much from them.

[2] If the result of the confidential conversation is not announced after iii. 21 as is done in the subsequent case iv. 39–42, the reason of the omission is simply that the Apostle did not consider it at all needful to state the at least partially good result; and he refers again below quite impartially to the man, vii. 50, xix. 39, which is not the case with the other instance just alluded to.

reverence became only women and youths, whilst all the great evils of the age advanced in spite of such a devotion.

The lengthy discourse, however, in which Christ expounds to him the true conditions of participation in the kingdom of God, derives its special form from the Apostle himself, like all similar discourses as reported by him. A little time ago, in the case of the history of the purification of the Temple, we saw that this Apostle reproduces some detached utterances of Jesus in their most accurate and original form: but this cannot be the case, from the nature of things, and as all closer examination shows, with any of the longer discourses that have been elaborated with deliberate art. Thus this discourse also is a model of Christian truth and plainness, and undoubtedly as regards its fundamental basis has grown up from truths which Christ himself proclaimed: that which is peculiar to the Apostle is scarcely anything more than the combination of all these utterances into one whole. The fundamental condition of all participation in the kingdom of God and its salvation is regeneration (as the Baptist had previously required); but this regeneration must not be effected merely (as in baptism, to use a comparison) by water, but likewise by spirit, so that the man becomes a perfectly willing instrument of the Divine spirit itself, and suffers himself to be driven and moved by it as by the right wind; and if this is still obscure to anyone, so that he does not comprehend how he can permit himself to be laid hold upon and conducted to eternal salvation by the spirit of God, then let him believe in him in whom all this has already been most perfectly fulfilled, and who has been appointed by God to bring by the profoundest suffering and the highest exaltation the eternal life and likewise the judgment of the world; let him look, therefore, truly into these celestial mysteries, to believe in which may be difficult, but the truth of which must nevertheless be believed by everyone whom the spirit has not at first led so completely and surely as Christ himself; and let him follow that which he finds Christ says and does. By these three propositions[1] is in fact conveyed the most profound and exhaustive statement of the way which everyone must take who desires really to participate in the kingdom and the salvation of God: but with respect to the peculiar form of the utterances, the specially Johannine conceptions and phrases occur all the more freely in this discourse the longer and the more unre-

[1] John iii. 1-3; 4-8; 9-21: strictly in these three propositions the thought is progressively stated, so that the following one further expounds in each case the preceding one.

strainedly it is continued;[1] and the few words which John makes Nicodemus himself interpose really only serve to further the progressive unfolding of the thought of the long discourse itself, and the clear disposition of the three great principles on which everything in this case depends.

However, Jesus stayed on that occasion some while in the province of Judea; and his more intimate followers, who had some of them been previously disciples of the Baptist,[2] and could also have been employed by the Baptist as his assistants in baptising, continued to administer that rite when they met with suitable waters; but now, as a matter of course, baptising not with a view to an unknown Messiah who was about to come, but with definite reference to Jesus as the known Messiah. We have already seen[3] that the rite of baptism must in some form be continued by Christianity; but if, as soon as Christianity was sufficiently established, baptism then necessarily (as we shall see below) took a somewhat different form, inasmuch as the communication of the Spirit became henceforth the chief feature in it, so that even former disciples of John were rebaptised,[4] it followed that, at that time, when Christ had hardly begun his work, and during his whole life on earth, the baptism of Jesus was distinguished from the baptism of John thereby that the hope of the candidate was on its administration directed, not to the Messiah as unknown, but quite definitely to the Messiah to be looked for in Jesus; as appears from our previous consideration of the relation of

[1] It is not without purpose that the idea of the kingdom of Heaven is mentioned merely at the beginning vv. 3, 5, and subsequently both in this and in the other long discourses is absent: we see how the Apostle everywhere proceeds first from the ancient established reminiscences. In the exposition of the second great proposition also, vv. 4–8, there is scarcely anything that Christ could not have uttered verbatim. It is with the third proposition that the more peculiarly Apostolic form of the discourse commences: and the very first utterance, ver. 11, is very similar to i. 11, 12, 14, 16; iii. 31, 32, and the beginning of the first Epistle. And as the discourse here begins to expound the celestial, i.e., the Messianic mysteries, the exceedingly emphatic asseveration at the beginning, ver. 11, is thereby explained as the more necessary, inasmuch as these mysteries are misconceived by those who do not so much as desire to understand the nature of general spiritual things which had been sufficiently explained in the Old Testament; for those things which had been taught in the Old Testament, and were therefore in so far the more easily to be understood and believed, on account of not understanding which Nicodemus, as *the* (that is, official, which Jesus was not) *teacher of Israel*, is censured, ver. 10, are simply those general spiritual things which had been previously, vv. 4–8, expounded, and which precisely in contrast with those absolutely sublime Messianic matters are called *earthly things*, ver. 12, comp. vv. 31, 32. Accordingly ver. 12 εἶπον must be taken as plural, *they* (the ancients, also already) *told*, and ἐπιστεύσατε read instead of πιστεύετε.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 244 sq.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 160 sq.

[4] According to Acts xix. 1–7; comp. xviii. 25, viii. 12–17. In the last words of Christ, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, the commission to baptise is not new, but that to baptise *all nations*; and it is purely accidental if, apart from this passage (John

John and Jesus.[1] Moreover, in as far as Christ from the very beginning defined the purity of the soul—which baptism was intended to impart—in many respects quite differently from John, transforming the rigorous life which John demanded into a life of divine joy and love, baptism itself also received thus early amongst the followers of Jesus a new meaning, which might lead to very great departures from the conceptions and principles of the Baptist.

From the nature of the case Jesus necessarily permitted this new form of baptism, but could not himself baptise,[2] since otherwise he would have had to baptise unto himself and unto his own name, which even for his own dignity's sake he could not do—just as little as any Christian, or conscientious, king, which is the same thing, in our time, will directly administer to anyone the oath of allegiance to himself—even if he had not avoided it from true modesty as unseemly. Without doubt it was then that some of the disciples of Jesus first began this their special kind of baptism. Baptism in the waters of the Jordan, or elsewhere in suitable places, was, still, too new and attractive to be abandoned; and particularly this new kind of baptism rapidly found so many friends that the disciples of John, who continued the earlier kind, were soon involved in a contention with a Judean who maintained that the cleansing which the new kind effected must be much more powerful and spiritual than that effected by the earlier. When these disciples of John then complained of this to the Baptist himself and sought to excite him against the rapid progress of the new kind of baptism, he set their fears at rest, and pointed out to them that a rapid growth of the new movement was in fact nothing but what must be desired. It is true it is the Apostle who puts these words into the mouth of the Baptist,[3] and the particular forms of expression may be coloured by the style of speaking peculiar to the Apostle, rather than reproduce quite minutely what the Baptist said at that time about Jesus; but it cannot be doubted that he then still spoke in this sense. He remained thereby simply faithful to that which he had

iii. 22—iv. 2), there is no further mention in the Gospels of baptising by his disciples. The language of Jesus and his disciples is perpetually full of figures taken from this rite, whence it would likewise follow that baptism continued to be in perpetual use.

[1] *Ante*, pp. 172 sq.

[2] As the more indefinite expressions iii. 27, iv. 1, are more particularly explained, John iv. 2; the briefer phrase, 'Jesus baptised,' could only arise in contrast with the other, 'John baptised,' which had then long been in use.

[3] John iii. 27–36. It is most easy to see from this example how the Apostle introduces his own peculiar mode of speaking.

from the first surmised and desired respecting Jesus;[1] and if he had at first certainly not expected that Jesus would have so long delayed to come forward with his full Messianic claims and work, still less that he would himself sanction a new form of the preparatory rite of baptism, nevertheless a chief point of essential moment in his view of the future, and which now seemed about to be confirmed—namely, the rapid progress of the new movement, must have appeared to him desirable. He could at that time, really with great appropriateness, compare himself, as the Apostle indicates the use of this figure,[2] with the bosom friend of a bridegroom, who must rejoice that the bridegroom will bring home the bride as soon as possible, and assiduously attends upon all his steps and his commands, watching whether at last the high moment of boundless joy at the actual marriage has come; that bride whom he as well as Christ meant was the perfected Community of God, and the kingdom of God itself; only that the Baptist at the same time conceived the manner of the winning and bringing home of this bride in a different way from Christ. The appropriate figure itself often recurs in those times of boundless expectation and joyous hope.[3]

Meantime the year—with the Paschal commencement of which Jesus had gone to Jerusalem—was already far advanced: there were but four months more to the next corn harvest.[4] The new kind of baptism practised by his disciples had also not a little aroused the attention of the Pharisees[5] and other wise men of the capital; but Jesus deemed it for the present better to avoid their germinating suspicion, and resolved to return to Galilee by way of Samaria. As for the first time making trials in various directions, he had as yet no reason for avoiding Samaria, though subsequently such reasons arose, still less did he shrink from carrying his truth, if it should be sought, into a half-heathen land. Accordingly he came to a small town, Sychar,[6] in the neighbourhood of the ancient Sichem, which

[1] See *ante*, pp. 192 sq.

[2] John iii. 29. The words are so peculiar that one might be compelled to conjecture that the figure which had down to Christian times been so rare, was borrowed from an earlier Hebrew book. [Comp. more fully the author's commentary *Johan. Schriften*, i. p. 177.]

[3] See Rev. xix. 7, xxi. 2, 9, and in a more remote way Matt. xxv. 1 sq., Rev. iii. 20. The present books of the Old Testament present scarcely the germs of this figure, which was so popular in early Christian times, inasmuch as such words as Cant. ii. 9, v. 2, even when they were allegorised, did not at all contain this figure used in John's Gospel.

[4] According to the incidental remark John iv. 35, which must be sufficiently accurate.

[5] Of all the kinds of Judean scholars, John mentions iv. 1 and elsewhere the Pharisees only, as the class which was then generally most influential, and subsequently least to be forgotten.

[6] The conjecture might occur that

was at that time still a very large city, and as it was getting late, towards six in the evening, he seated himself, weary as he was, upon the well of Jacob, which was by the roadside,[1] and which, renowned from very earliest times, was still particularly sacred to the Samaritans as a memorial of the ancient fame of their own land.

While his disciples were then gone into the town to buy food, he requested a Samaritan woman who had just come to draw water to allow him to drink, referred her at once—as she was surprised that a Judean could ask anything from her, considering the well-known mortal enmity between the two nations—to the infinitely better return gift of living water which he could make her, and as she did not immediately comprehend this, explained particularly to her what this water of life was. Remaining still a good deal confused with regard to what he really meant, she then, it is true, urgently requested him to give her this living water: but as she was nevertheless still far from being sufficiently prepared to understand it, he suddenly turns the conversation to an apparently foreign and unimportant matter, requiring her to fetch her husband. She then immediately commits herself in her attempt to hide the true state of her sinful family-life from his piercing glance: so at last she must plainly feel that an unusual prophet is before her, and already the surmise is rising within her that the superiority of the Judean religion that produces such prophets is after all well-founded.[2] But the time has then come to explain to her the general relation of the false to the true religion, to point her to the consummation of all true religion, which is at last necessarily to be expected, and, indeed, is already close at hand, and to communicate to her things which she has

Sychar, which is not elsewhere mentioned in the Bible, is identical with Sichem. In that case it would be best to suppose that the name had at that time been thus disfigured amongst the Judeans in a nickname which had been generally adopted (see vol. v. p. 221), as Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* p. 938, had already proposed a conjecture of this kind. To understand the possibility of the use of such plays on names in that time, comp. vol. v. pp. 228, 303. But Sichem was, according to Gen. xlviii. 22, Jos. xxiv. 32, the place itself which Jacob gave to Joseph; whilst Sychar was situated, according to John, only near to the place. It is better, therefore, to think of another place in the neighbourhood. As to that place, see the *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. pp. 255 sq., and my remarks on the book of John Mills, *Three Months' Residence at Nablus*, in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, pp. 1669 sq. [The place near to Sichem, which Ewald adopts in his *Jahrbb. l. c.* as the original Sychar, is the village *el-'Ascar*, on the road from Nablus to Beisan, about half an hour to the east of Nablus, and a quarter of an hour north of Jacob's well.—Tr.]

[1] It is still shown in the neighbourhood of the present city *Nablus*—i.e. the ancient Sichem, as recent travellers announce; comp. especially the chief work above mentioned by John Mills.

[2] That is, this must be the meaning of the words iv. 20, which are rather suggestive than expressive of the inferences they involve.

never before heard in such a manner.[1] And already she suspects and hears that the Messiah himself is certainly standing before her, and hastens into the town to communicate to others her germinating faith. Before she has departed the disciples return from the town, but instead of finding the two (as they might fear from the hostility between Samaritans and Jews) engaged in contention and unfriendly altercation,[2] find them, on the contrary, most unexpectedly tranquil, and the woman about to hasten into the town for joy. They are themselves at first, as it were, struck dumb with astonishment at this scene of a converted Samaritan woman, and request him at last, after she had gone away, to eat: but he likewise is now so affected by the new truth which has been taught by this instance, and by the prophetic anticipation of the future completion of the conversion of others than the Jews of which this instance is the commencement, that he has forgotten his physical hunger and thirst, prefers also for his own part to think only of that eternal food which is presented to him by the prosecution and completion of his work, and although all this is but a small beginning, and as a first seed-sowing, he nevertheless already in spirit sees the great harvest ripening for himself and still more for his disciples.[3] For if even Samaritans become believers, how much more is the true great harvest, that is, the completion of his work generally, to be hoped for soon; in the same way as then, at seedtime in the late autumn, the harvest seemed so far off, but his spirit could discern the fields already white for harvest.[4] And, in fact, the narrative

[1] When it is said, ver. 22, 'Ye (Samaritans) worship ye know not *what*,' this can only describe a religion which does not know with regard even to the true things which are contained, or may be contained in it, what purpose they are really intended to serve and what must result from them; whilst the Judeans, amongst whom alone the Messianic hopes flourished in their original strength and certainty, still possessed at least in them a clear and certain religion of the future; and only such a religion that on the basis of its own living truths embraces the whole future also, and includes within itself a living eternal hope, can be a true one. Very analogous, therefore, is what Paul says to the Athenians, Acts xvii. 23.

[2] Accordingly in this case, John iv. 28, the most beautiful contrast to the altercation (ζήτησις) which had just before, iii. 25, arisen amongst men *about him*!

[3] Christ is, according to ver. 34, himself also the reaper, but certainly only in so far as the genuine well-founded hope is itself something which highly exalts and rewards the soul; far more are the disciples, indeed they only in the full sense, the reapers, according to vv. 36–38, so that in that respect the proverb that no one can at the same time sow and reap, and the sower is always another than the reaper, is confirmed more especially in his case. We have no longer the means of knowing particularly how the proverb referred to v. 37 arose. But the last words, ver. 38, bear quite the impress of having come from the midst of the Apostolic age: and still in the plur. ἄλλοι just as in οἴδαμεν iii. 11, the delicate feeling of the profoundly characteristic modesty of the Lord himself makes itself felt.

[4] The whole piece, ch. iv. 1–42, therefore falls substantially into these three

states at the close, the Samaritans made such a friendly response to him that he was obliged to stay with them longer than he had intended; indeed, many believed in his Messianic dignity not on account merely of the report of the woman, but also as guided by their own constantly increasing conviction.

Thus with every, and even apparently unimportant, occasion there is connected the unfolding of the highest truth; and thus undoubtedly before this truth at last even the most obdurate hostility of the nations and past religions must disappear: these are at the same time great lessons which this narrative may also incidentally supply. And there is the less reason to doubt the historical foundation of the narrative, inasmuch as we are at this point still only being introduced to the very first commencement of the Messianic labours; although here also it is impossible not to see that though the Apostle recalls vividly enough those initiatory times with their apparently insignificant and yet really most important occurrences, he still could not complete the detailed description without using the colours of his own peculiar language and higher conceptions.

3. *The successful return to Galilee and the new Messianic position.*

As he now made his return this time to Galilee, the Galileans received him with much more faith than previously, inasmuch as he now appeared amongst them as one who had already in various ways approved himself in the great capital; and on his very entrance into the heart of Galilee again a wonderful event occurred, which seemed to the Apostle, both on its own account and on account of its temporal and local similarity, to deserve to be placed as the second by the side of the first miracle mentioned above,[1] which took place on his first entrance into this land, and also to be described somewhat at length.

He made his return to Capernaum by way of Cana,[2] which had before proved so sympathetic towards him; nor was the detour by way of this place very considerable: and as soon as he had

parts: (1) there is a water of life, vv. 1–14; (2) it is to be obtained by spiritual religion and service, vv. 15–24; (3) and its preparatory servant is Christ, vv. 25–42. The plan and execution, therefore, are essentially occupied with the same fundamental thought of the Gospel, and fall essentially into the same three divisions as in ch. iii. 1–21.

[1] *Ante*, pp. 249 sq.

[2] On the journey thither, therefore, we should be compelled to place the incident which is narrated Luke iv. 16–30 as having occurred in Nazareth; however, we must defer speaking of this until a suitable subsequent occasion.

arrived there, the report of his return by slow stages spread rapidly also to Capernaum. Accordingly a man of position, who had been for a considerable time resident in Capernaum, hastened thence to Cana to meet him. The man was a captain [1] in the service of the Tetrarch Antipas, and though himself a heathen, had long taken a deep interest in the welfare of the Judeans, in particular that he had most actively assisted in the building of the Synagogue at Capernaum. His son was now seriously ill, and he came, attended by the grateful heads of the Synagogue, to Cana, to meet Jesus, that he might request from him the cure of his son, and therefore that he would hasten his return to Capernaum. Although entreated also by the respected Judeans to help the son of the heathen captain, Jesus at first declined to give assistance, justly displeased that before they would believe in his higher truth, they always desired to see signs and wonders. But the firm simple faith of the man refused to yield; according to one account he was in his faith, like a genuine soldier, so immovable and yet so simple-minded, that he supposed, just as he as a captain obeyed higher commands and again himself imposed unconditional obedience upon his soldiers, so the Messiah could command the great and small demons by a word to leave their victim. Accordingly Jesus promised him help, and sent him home with hope. It was then seven in the evening: he stayed the night in Cana. But early the next morning servants from his house met him on the way, and to his astonishment he learnt that the fever had left his son just at seven the previous evening. So he felt his faith wonderfully strengthened; and his whole house, embracing many members, also believed, presenting the first and a great example thus early of this kind. All this, however, was so significant inasmuch as it was a heathen family, as the earlier account expressly mentions.[2]

[1] In the above description of this incident we have supposed that the narrative John iv. 46–54 is ultimately identical with that of Luke vii. 1–10, Matt. viii. 5–13, which was originally found in Mark also [comp. *Die Drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 279 sq.] The differences between the two accounts are at first sight important, but on closer consideration so small, and the most essential similarities so decisive, that there can be no doubt of their ultimate derivation from one event. But the superiority of a more graphic presentation of all the circumstances is then undoubtedly on the side of John's account; and in this case also the fact is confirmed that he accurately recollected the details, although he here passes slightly over many particulars, and the other account may likewise serve to fill up several points. This being so, the *παῖς* in Matt. seems to have been originally *child*, and not *δοῦλος*, which Luke substituted for it: the word then interchanges with *υἱὸς*, as Matt. xvii. 18 compared with ver. 15, although it also stands for *δοῦλος* Matt. xii. 18, xiv. 2, and of itself therefore might be of doubtful meaning. The remaining differences are easily explained.

[2] Luke vii. 9, Matt. viii. 10–12. If John does not specially mention this, the

The account of this event must have been early widely spread, and for that very reason have assumed various forms. It occurs again in its essential features in the earlier traditions, and though there it is transferred, in conformity with the nature of that set of traditions, to a somewhat later period, it still appears there also at the transition point of an important section of Christ's public life.

About this time, that is, or in any case soon afterwards, the Baptist must have been imprisoned; though we cannot determine very exactly the precise date of that event, we know certainly that it occurred somewhere about this time.[1] This event necessarily reacted very strongly upon the work of Jesus which had only just begun. As regards its temporal occasion, his work was a continuation and completion of that of the Baptist: it was now as if the outward foundation had been shaken upon which the grander fabric of his own work arose. And if the world so seriously threatened, and was determined to destroy, even this in reality much more insignificant work of the Baptist, as dangerous to it, how much more must he fear that it would soon likewise seek violently to assail and with all its force annihilate his own undertaking which had scarcely been fully commenced. If he was not prepared therefore at once to suffer his work to remain in abeyance again, he must precisely at this juncture prosecute it with redoubled zeal and energy, and, indeed, we may say, he must as it were begin it afresh. For hitherto the great work of rejuvenating Israel, and of the mighty effort to consummate all its higher treasures, had rested almost in equal parts upon the older man, who was widely known, and the younger one, who was only just becoming properly known: if therefore the first fell, and if manifestly his disciples suffered, at least for the moment, a severe check from the imprisonment of their master, then the higher duty not to permit this whole work to collapse

cause of his omission can only be, that to him generally the earlier differences between what was once Judean and what was heathen, appeared already as of small importance, and were thrust into the background by the Christianity that was already widely spread and flourishing greatly in Asia Minor. This is shown by his entire Gospel, if it is in this respect compared with the earlier Gospels; and the extent to which the contrast between the Judean converts and those not Judean had significance in his estimation, had been sufficiently brought forward in the narrative regarding the Samaritans (*ante*, pp. 265 sq. We cannot therefore find in this respect either any reason for denying the original identity of the event in both accounts.

[1] In the piece immediately following, v. 35, John really presupposes the removal of the Baptist as having already taken place, as generally the following long discourse, v. 19–47, cast as if intentionally a backward glance at the then closed labours of the Baptist. Further, comp. *ante*, pp. 242 sq.

again devolved upon Jesus alone; and the new obligation commenced for him to begin precisely at this juncture afresh the true work of his life with both an energy and decision, and a prudence and a higher wisdom, such as had hitherto not been required in such measures. Hitherto all his Messianic work had been only a prelude and experiment in comparison with that which had now to be undertaken: and must in later times the more appear so in proportion as the progress of his work was now for the first time manifested on a greater scale to the world. This is a chief reason why the recollection of the fact in the Evangelical narratives was somewhat early dimmed, although at the same time it could not be wholly lost.

The history of the Temptation.

From the consideration just referred to it is not difficult to understand why the form of Evangelical narrative previous to John's should represent the imprisonment of the Baptist as the beginning of the Messianic labours of Jesus: it was at that time usually narrated simply, that after this imprisonment he went into Galilee to begin the public proclamation of the gospel.

Still the interval between the baptism of Jesus and this his appearance in Galilee was not by any means left wholly blank by that simpler form of narration; so firmly after all had the reminiscence been preserved of a considerable interval between the two events. Moreover, it was also well remembered that that interval had been only like a period of first experiment and of the proper preparation of the spirit: for when the spirit makes at first trials of itself, it can best prepare itself to obtain the utmost strength, clearness, and decision which are essential to enable it actually to begin and successfully carry out a great work. But where a simple experiment is being conducted, temptation is always on the alert and close at hand: for that which is perfectly the right thing to be done is by the nature of the case not yet actually set about, so that all kinds of error, mistakes, and harmful courses may at all events suggest themselves in thought, and the power of error may precisely as a power come nearer to the mind and endeavour to get the mastery of it. This is temptation such as may assail even the purest and strongest spirit; such as is the more unavoidable as the work to be tried is greater; and such as is even divinely necessary in order to separate the possible error previous to a

great course of work, and can become divinely beneficent if it simply serves to separate, and from the very beginning forcibly repel, all these kinds of error, which are possible in the case of every work. Indeed, in so far it may be regarded as a divine benefit even for the Messianic work—the greatest work of human history—as it was about to concentrate and complete itself in Jesus, that it should pass through such a period of experiment,—it was well that this work found at the right time a brief period in which first to make trial of itself before it had, after the removal of the Baptist, to manifest itself immediately in its purest and loftiest operation, and first in this preliminary school of temptation make full acquaintance with and for ever repel all the various errors and misleading forces which must become dangerous, and indeed destructive to it, if they had not been even beforehand most decisively chased away.

Now, inasmuch as that interval in the life of Jesus between his baptism and the imprisonment of the Baptist became in men's memories only as an obscure, but for the future most important initiatory period, it came early to be looked upon as the time of the temptation of the Messiah. Thereby the way was made for a true conception, which needed but to be further followed up by the higher view of his whole history, to serve for the elucidation of a multitude of the highest truths which belong precisely to the special history of the commencement of his work and are taught by it. This has been done in the more detailed history of the Temptation.[1] But the immediate occasion that gave rise to the special narrative that this Temptation by Satan, reckoned to last forty days according to well-known previous examples in the Old Testament, was located precisely in the desert inhabited by wild beasts, was certainly presented by the reminiscence of the last stay of Jesus in southern Judea and in the neighbourhood of the Baptist.[2] This stay had lasted, according to the indications explained above, for a considerable time, so that forty days are only a generally suitable estimate of its length; and from it he had gone directly to Galilee to make the full commencement of his

[1] See as regards its meaning and details my work *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 194–200, 2nd ed. Very similar (as far as similarity is possible in the case of such great dissimilarity in other respects) to the general manner in which the *Book of the Higher History* (see *Jahrbb. der. B. W.* ii. pp. 208 sq. [now 2nd ed. of *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 80 sq.]) makes Satan from the very beginning active through all the phases of Christ's history, is the introduction of *Mah-Nath* as the enemy of Buddha in the Pali-Birmah narrative of the life of Buddha, see *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, iii. pp. 1–163

[2] See *ante*, p. 262.

great work, as we shall further see. In so far also there is connected with this narrative a true piece of genuine reminiscence.

Besides these, some further isolated facts from this earliest Messianic period, the more detailed recollection of which we owe to John, have been preserved in the form of narrative which preceded John's; but they have there been misplaced chronologically and brought into connection with other events. Some of them we have already remarked upon as the occasion arose; perhaps others belong to this period, only it is difficult now to restore them to their original chronological place.

II. Until the Choice of the Twelve and the approaching Death of the Baptist.

The founding of the Messianic kingdom.

If we now look at the altered attitude which Jesus now gave to the Messianic proclamation and activity, we find that it consisted, as regards its inner nature, simply in a still more pointed direction of all forces to that one object which had already been proposed and become quite plain, and hence in, if possible, a still greater assiduity, consequentiality, decision, publicity, and boldness, allied with that greater caution and wise reserve which were required by this increased decisiveness as well as by past experiences. The change must, by the very nature of the case, have been of this kind, and the traces left by historical reminiscence plainly show that it was such. In his own personal views, determinations, and conflicts, as they were derived from the profoundest depths of his spiritual nature, there now took place no change; it was only his attitude with regard to the world that had become different, just as this world itself had altered. It was now his task to show himself fully, in every respect and without intermission, as the active ruler in his kingdom; and it is only his own peculiar majesty and glory which was at once fully evinced at this stage of his vocation also, and throughout all its duties and toils no less than in all its joys and victories.

But when the fullest activity reaches its greatest intensity and effort, it must all the more necessarily restrict itself in the area of its operations, that it may not weaken or destroy itself by unnecessary division and want of concentration. And as in the whole Messianic work of Jesus, inner necessity and outward

compulsion so marvellously and unerringly answer to each other, so also in this particular instance. For if he was now compelled by the very intensity of his activity to limit the area of it, in comparison with the unlimited extent of it which was quite appropriate in that first period of initiation and experiment, his past experience showed him that this was an external necessity and pointed out to him the way that he had to take. For it had already been shown, as we have seen,[1] that the large majority of the wise men and rulers in the proud capital had no sympathy with the profound meaning of his undertaking; whilst it had already been as plainly proved that his own immediate Galilean fellow-countrymen were now inclined to enter into his designs, after they had seen how, in Jerusalem itself, he had done such great things and that he had at last attained a high reputation in the opinion of some. Accordingly he resolved to devote himself principally to the Galileans, and to lay the immovable foundation of his kingdom in a smaller but more familiar sphere; and the peculiar characteristics of the Galileans might come to his assistance in this work.

For though the Galileans were at that time not greatly respected, as remote country people, by the proud inhabitants of the capital,[2] and offence was taken there even at their less elegant pronunciation, by which they could always be easily distinguished,[3] there was in fact none of the populations of the Holy Land, which were at that time so various, who were so able and so fitted to receive the gospel, from the moment of its earliest and, therefore, most difficult commencement, as precisely the Galileans. It is true that no corner of the Holy Land had, from the first days of the decline of the ancient national power, suffered so much through the inroads of the heathen as the northern and the eastern parts of the country that were included within its ancient boundaries, and the great prophets also complain much of this calamity;[4] but those communities, though there they were often quite isolated, which had under these heaviest sufferings and longest temptations nevertheless remained faithful to the true religion, approved themselves more nobly in all the hours of new danger. And if the countries further to the east had gradually been more and more occupied by heathen nations, the Galileans at all events still

[1] *Ante*, p. 258.

[2] Simply this and nothing more is conveyed by the words 'from Nazareth can any good thing come?' John i. 47, compared with the perfectly analogous words, 'Surely, Christ cometh not out of Galilee?' vii. 41.

[3] Mark xiv. 70, Matt. xxvi. 73, and the Talmudic illustrations to these passages in Lightfoot.

[4] See vol. iv. pp. 64 sq., 161 sq.

dwelt thickly together over a considerable extent of country; and they particularly had, ever since the rise of the new Jerusalem, adhered the more decidedly and unanimously to the new Temple, and had remained faithful to it through all those five centuries, in spite of all the calamities of war and other difficulties of various kinds.[1] It is true the Samaritans gradually formed between them and the Judeans an intermediate population, which grew more and more a means of serious separation; and towards every point of the compass these Galilean Judeans were in many ways shut in and confined by heathen towns and left without any fixed boundaries; but they only adhered constantly with all the more tenacity to the distant sanctuary. And, compared with the inhabitants of the capital and its immediate province, the Galileans in their fruitful plain to the south, their mountainous and cavernous region to the north, and their most richly favoured districts on the shores of the Lake of Gennesareth and the right bank of the Jordan, had really remained much more simple, vigorous, and open to lasting impressions than the Judeans in the strict sense.

We have already seen, even from the time of the Asmoneans, these more simple and open-hearted Galileans exerting a considerable influence more and more plainly upon the southern Judeans; those who were persecuted in Judea often fled into their castles, ravines, and caves, and not infrequently found amongst them their most tenacious defenders. But now they were to range themselves around one from their own midst, who sought to make them the foremost champions of a kingdom hitherto unknown; and so unusual as were the sacrifices this summons required, never has a call been at last so perfectly responded to as by some chosen spirits amongst these Galilean peasants, fishermen, and publicans; though, truly, until that moment no corner of the earth echoed to such a call, or was permeated by such a flood of new and miraculous energy of life, as these no less varied than narrow, and greatly divided, thickly-populated tracts of Galilee. And if it is an eternal law of higher compensation that a much humiliated and despised portion of a country, which may often have been ill-treated for centuries together, shall at last, like all other unjustly despised things, attain to all the greater honour, so now in this case the northern corner of the Holy Land that had formerly almost gone to ruin begins to receive the noblest distinction; and after this distinction had become a perceptible

[1] See vol. v. 58, 314 sq.

historical fact, it was natural that such passages of the Old Testament should appear to receive a wholly fresh, and, indeed, their best confirmation, in which formerly the heart of the great prophets, when overwhelmed by the view of the sufferings of these districts, had nevertheless, under the elevating influence of the Messianic hope, anticipated a future righteous distinction for them.[1]

But the same increased effort which induced Jesus now to confine his labours principally to Galilee, induced him likewise now to receive some of these Galileans into his closer confidence, so that they might be continually about him and his spirit might be perfectly transmitted to them. These were not as yet the Twelve, whose appointment will be described below; in the case of these intimate friends, the question of their definite number was of no consequence whatever; nor, indeed, was such a definite line of instruction and training, as we shall see was followed with the Twelve, a matter of chief moment. But undoubtedly the relation to him of these men who were now adopted as his constant attendants was quite a different one from that of his first attendants and disciples: while the latter almost all voluntarily attached themselves to him and he only refrained from repelling them, these constant companions lived with him probably even as members of the same household and social circle, and accompanied him everywhere that he desired. On that very account they cannot have been a large number; and according to a standing reminiscence they were only the four[2] who had formerly and first voluntarily attached themselves to him and whom he had now known for a long time, the brothers Simon and Andrew, and the sons of Zebedee, James and John. He may now have called these sons of fishermen to him with that utterance which had all along been well remembered, 'Come ye, that I may make of you (perhaps something better) fishers of men,' since he at this very time sought to receive them for the future into his closer fellowship: and it is easy to understand that now they followed him so much the more willingly; the sons of Zebedee also, although they came from a comparatively wealthy house, and now forsook it as good as for ever.[3] The two pairs of brothers lived accordingly at that time by the Lake of Galilee, not far from each other.

[1] The passage Matt. iv. 12–16, with its reference to Isa. viii. 23, 24 (A.V. ix, 1, 2), dates from the last author of the present first Gospel.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 245 sq.

[3] Mark i. 16–20, Matt. iv. 18–22; comp. *ante*, p. 131.

Instead of this simpler narrative Luke[1] has adopted from a somewhat later book a much more elaborate and magnificent one, in which Christ and Peter only are the two persons taking the principal active part, and the sons of Zebedee appear simply as the business partners and afterwards as the associates in faith of Peter, while at the same time the commencement of higher faith itself is more profoundly described. Just when Jesus is engaged in teaching the people, he sees two boats lying unused by the shores of the Lake, the boatmen to whom they belong being at the time occupied in mending their nets:[2] the previous night they have caught nothing. He enters the boat of Peter, requests him to push it a little further into the water, and thus teaches from its raised bow the people that are on the shore.[3] He then has the same boat pushed off further into the Lake, and commands the nets to be cast. At first Peter has doubts, after the ill success of the last night, about a successful haul; but, on the other hand, has been so much inspired by a higher faith in consequence of the teaching of Christ which he has previously heard, that he now at his word casts out the nets. This time he takes more than could be expected for both boats, even with the most prosperous haul: and the first impression made upon him by this undeserved blessing is so overpowering that he falls at the feet of the Master, as one who is too holy for him, with the request to leave him the sinful man; for however full of blessing the presence of holiness may be, man oppressed by the burden of sin nevertheless feels himself more humbled than elevated by it, because he must fear that the same power which he has this time felt as unexpectedly rich in blessing, may another time, when he perhaps has unwittingly sinned against it, as unexpectedly destroy him. But rejoiced at this very sincerity of Peter, Christ raises him now all the more into his immediate fellowship, comforting him and chasing away his gloomy fears: and having now been elevated by him to the dignity of fishers of men, those three who often appear elsewhere in the Evangelical reminiscences as being nearest to him, follow him now all the more exclusively, forsaking all earthly things. It cannot, indeed, be doubted that many of the higher traits of this account originated in a later and generally more spiritual class

[1] Luke v. 1–11; comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 237 sq.

[2] At the beginning, as well as at its close, this account therefore still keeps up its connection with the much simpler earlier one.

[3] Comp. in Mark iv. 1, or rather Matt. xiii. 2, in the Collected Sayings, a similar description.

of such reminiscences.[1] But however the narrative may have received this its higher form, based as this is upon innumerable previous observations and truths, it ultimately teaches after all simply how a lower form of faith is raised to a higher form, and that this higher form is the commencement of all true following of Christ. Moreover, the active presence of the true spirit and of Christ himself can promote earthly prosperity and physical blessing also, and in his joy may be felt to be doubly joyful; this is a wholesome truth of the Evangelical experience and history[2] which occurs elsewhere, and some form of the actual experience of the truth must have originally constituted the foundation of the accounts. But whoever feels merely this lower blessing, to him there clings therefrom all along a lower dread which must be transformed into the higher reverence before he can attain to even the true beginning of the proper service of the Master in and with everything.

Of others whom Jesus received during this time into his intimate confidence, the only one now mentioned is *Levi the son of Alphæus*.[3] He was a well-to-do collector of taxes, and as such did not stand, according to the general prejudice of the time, in good repute; nevertheless Jesus invited him to him, and that he might obey the call he gladly sacrificed all his previous earthly advantages. However, we know nothing of his later history; undoubtedly he did not subsequently belong to the Twelve. But the family of Alphæus appears again subsequently as on intimate terms with Christ; and the James belonging to this family, who afterwards appears amongst the Twelve, was probably a younger brother of this Levi.

This was in general the position of Jesus at that period. As the period of the commencement of his fullest and most uninterrupted Messianic labours, when the primary lasting foundations of his kingdom had to be procured and laid, it must have been in many respects the most toilsome and difficult time, full of endless effort and most exhausting labours; and

[1] If the question is asked whether the narrative John xxi. 6–22, which is so perfectly similar as regards these higher traits, though it belongs to the very different series of reminiscences of the risen Christ, or this of Luke's, is the earlier, and which of the two influenced the formation of the other, we must regard that of John xxi. as the earlier, because such traits belong naturally to the above-mentioned series. Only it does not follow from that fact by any means that the present piece, John xxi., was also written earlier. In conclusion, this piece which is here received by Luke in the work vi. [see *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 89 sq. and Translator's Preface] stood originally at the beginning of the narratives of the call of the Apostles, while Luke iv. 38, places the acquaintance of Peter with Jesus earlier.

[2] John xxi. 6, 7, and the similar narratives of the feeding of the multitudes, above, p. 226, referred to, and to be further considered below.

[3] Mark ii. 14, 15; comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 246 sq.

this period, as we shall see, lasted not less than a year. But of the details of this period of the deepest founding of the whole Messianic edifice, we still continue to know less than perhaps we might desire. For on the one hand, this period also, although everything in it is already about to burst into full bloom, really does not reach the period of the highest perfection of the Messianic labours, so that the Gospel of Mark even, to which alone we are now indebted for a somewhat fuller and clearer sketch of it, in reality narrates comparatively little of it. On the other hand, just at this point, where the earlier form of the Evangelical narrative began to enter somewhat more fully into the details, the narrative of John, with its more vivid recollection of all these early circumstances, comes almost to an end: obviously not unintentionally, inasmuch as John from this point onwards regarded the older accounts, at all events as far as the Galilean labours of Jesus were concerned, as already so complete that he did not find anything of great importance to add to them. Still, notwithstanding this lack of details, we are able, if we only carefully put together everything preserved regarding this period, including the narrative of John, to form a tolerably satisfactory conception of it, if not in all its details according to their exact chronological order, yet with regard to the main aspects of the special work of Jesus in the most exhaustive effort of founding his kingdom.

1. *His daily occupation.*

The Gospel of Mark[1] presents a picture of the course of his daily work at this period, describing at length all the various labours of one day, and of the time immediately following that day. It is the picture of his labours on the first day when he entered Capernaum as the permanent centre of his life at this time; and this day serves as an example of all similar days during the whole of this period, unless his ordinary work was interrupted by unusual occurrences.

It was a Sabbath. He went early into the Synagogue to teach; and his manner of teaching was so different from that of previous Biblical scholars, and the matter of it so forcibly overpowering, that his hearers were generally astonished, and involuntarily heard beneath his words, as it were, the Divine authority from which they flowed. But there was also present in the Synagogue a man tormented by an unclean spirit; and it was as if this spirit could the less hold his peace and conceal

[1] i. 21–45.

his true nature the more powerfully the discourse of Jesus was influenced by the Divine spirit, and the more profoundly all the other listeners were moved by it. At last, unable any longer to restrain himself in the presence of the Holy one, he began to speak aloud; and, as if he felt himself one with all others of his kind, he required that Jesus should cease speaking: 'they knew well that he was the Holy one of God, and had come to destroy them.' But Jesus, on his part, commanded him to be silent and come out of the man; indeed, he assailed him with such force that, though he still caused the man much pain, tearing him and crying aloud, he at length came out and left him alone. It was thereby shown that even the new preaching of the Messiah, and the force of his calm words, no longer left the impure spirits in peace, until at last, as soon as they exerted themselves, a still mightier word of his express command wholly expelled them; and if even the flight of the evil spirits before him created astonishment, the world must be still more amazed that the power of the new teaching simply was so great and everything ultimately proceeded from it.[1] It is correctly announced that precisely this soon spread his fame everywhere throughout the whole surrounding district of Galilee.[2]

When he had come out of the Synagogue, he visited the house of Peter, attended by the sons of Zebedee. Peter was at that time already married, but his mother-in-law, with whom he and his brother Andrew dwelt, was just then lying sick of a fever, and the fact was not kept from Jesus. But, coming near to her and taking her by the hand, he raised her up; and the fever left her so soon that she was able even the same midday to prepare them a meal and to attend upon them as hostess.

Thus the evening approached; he went to his own house. But now, in the cool of the day, as the Sabbath also was over, all the variously sick people, in body and mind, were brought to him, and it was as if the whole town had assembled at his door. He healed many of the sufferers of both kinds; but from the very first he sought to impose silence on the spirits of the demoniacs, that they might not break out into such an objectionable wild cry regarding him as the dreaded Messiah as that man in the Synagogue had done.

After a short night's repose he rose very early, while it was still twilight, to go to a solitary place outside the town. He was there praying alone with God; yet Peter and his friends

[1] I believe, therefore, still that ver. 27, καινῇ διδαχῇ, must be read, 'with new doctrine mightily (ruling) he commandeth also the impure spirits,' etc.

[2] Ver. 28. πανταχοῦ must be inserted, with the best authorities.

soon went after him, found him and told him that already many were again seeking him in the town. But he invited them to work with him elsewhere also, visiting the neighbouring smaller places; for in fact it was for this purpose also that he had now left the town. Accordingly he made a circuit, in his twofold capacity of preacher and healer, of the other places of Galilee.

Thus comprehensive and thus laborious was the daily work of Jesus at this time, as we can see from no other source so fully as the Gospel of Mark.[1] From the same Gospel we learn also the occasion by which this daily life, which, notwithstanding all its zeal and mighty activity, was so collected and calmly quiet, was first more seriously interrupted and disturbed. While Jesus was staying somewhere in Galilee, a leper made his way into the house, altogether contrary to the Law, which expressly expels those thus afflicted from society.[2] Only as touched by deep compassion did Jesus lay his healing hand upon the miserable man, who with strong faith wholly trusted him, but commanded him in the sternest words, immediately after he had healed him, to depart in all haste from the house and the whole land, to say nothing to anyone of his being healed, but first of all, in conformity with the Law, to present himself to the priests in Jerusalem as cured,[3] and then quietly to return to his ordinary occupation. But the man could not for joy at his recovery refrain from everywhere proclaiming aloud the history of it; so that Jesus, being on that account everywhere known and beforehand expected in every town, could hardly again quietly enter any one of them, and preferred to remain outside the towns in solitary places. But even then people came to him from all quarters, continually seeking

[1] I have before shown, in *Die drei ersten Evang.*, that the arrangement of the small pieces Mark i 21–45, is, as regards this period, throughout the primitive account, while in Luke, and still more in our present Matt., the order of events is interrupted. When the piece concerning the leper in our present Matt. viii. 1–4, contrary to Mark's order, is placed quite at the beginning, this may have arisen from a supposition of the last author of Matt. that the leper could not well have entered the house of Jesus, but must have remained in the open air, and therefore probably met Jesus as he came down from the mountain; for he had already placed the Sermon on the Mount at the beginning. But when Matt viii. 5 (comp. iv. 13) speaks of a return to Capernaum, this according to what we have seen above, pp. 267 sq., harmonises (unintentionally, certainly) with the more detailed recollections of John; so that we can the more confidently suppose that the original Gospel of Mark was, when it assumed its final shape, deprived of several words before i. 21, and that it had previously, at some suitable place, related probably somewhat more at length, only in its own manner, what we now find Matt. iv. 13.

[2] See *Antiquities*, p. 158; hence also is explained the strong expression ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ, Mark i. 43.

[3] See *Antiquities*, pp. 158 sq. In similar cases Jesus always insisted on the fulfilment of the requirements of the Law (see Luke xvii. 14).

his help. And from the nature of the case he returned early to Capernaum as his permanent place of abode.

2. *The journey to the Feast this year.*

The position and endeavour of Jesus during this whole period being as above described, it is not difficult to understand that he should now already prefer to remain as constantly as possible in Galilee rather than make the customary journeys to all the feasts in Jerusalem. It was not absolutely necessary for every man dwelling at a considerable distance to take every one of the three annual journeys; excuses were allowable, and, as regards the presentation of sacrifices, that could be done by proxy. And in the case of Jesus, there was then certainly more important work to be done.

But it is precisely at this point that the Gospel of John interposes again with its more particular distinction of the times and circumstances. According to John, Jesus made at least one journey this year to a feast at Jerusalem; for it admits of no doubt that the journey described John ch. v. is intended to fall within the limits of this period.[1] It is true that John does not here more particularly define which of the three annual feasts it was;[2] with regard to the events which had to be narrated, in this case much did not depend on this particular, and on that account John might be content to use the greater brevity of language. If, however, we must express the most probable supposition on the point, it was most likely the great autumn feast for which Jesus now journeyed to Jerusalem; at Easter of this year he had, as appears from what we have already seen, not been long in Galilee, and yet he desired evidently at this period to confine himself as much as possible to Galilee;[3] on that account alone it would be most appropriate to suppose the autumn. Moreover, the similarity of the next year (as will appear below), when he again went to Jerusalem for the autumn feast, is in favour of this supposition. And if the autumnal feast is meant, we understand most easily how John came to

[1] On the one hand, in consequence of the order of events described *ante*, pp. 264 sq.; on the other, because the Twelve are, subsequent to John ch. vi., constantly presupposed as already chosen, while in this chapter that is still not the case; their choice therefore falls, according to the indications of this Gospel, between ch. v. and ch. vi., with which also all the other circumstances to be mentioned below accord.

[2] Even if the reading ἑορτὴ without ἡ, John v. 1, could be, with Lachmann, regarded as the correct one.

[3] The account Mark ii. 23–28 also points, according to the special indication of time Luke vi. 1 (see *Die drei ersten Evang.* p. 251, 2nd ed.), to the fact that Jesus hardly visited Jerusalem at Easter this year.

designate it a long time afterwards simply as 'the feast of the Jews;' at that late time it no longer possessed for Christians anything like the significance attaching to the Passover, and could (particularly at the late time of the writing of this Gospel, and by such a man as John) be spoken of with such brevity.[1] The matter of the discourse which Jesus, according to this Gospel, delivered at that time in Jerusalem, also suits in a very special way this year; and it is principally only the great truths of this discourse on account of which John mentions the journey itself and the particular occasion for the utterance of precisely these words.

At a north-eastern gate of Jerusalem, called the *Sheepgate*, probably from the large numbers of sheep for the sacrifices which entered there, there was situated a pool, *Bethesda*,[2] the water of which, as being in the neighbourhood of the Temple, and particularly as it appeared to rise and fall[3] in a mysterious manner, was supposed to possess healing virtue. According to the common opinion an angel at times caused it to rise, and the first sufferer who then descended into it might, according to the same opinion, in many cases be made whole.[4] In the five porches which had been built around the pool lay continually a multitude of blind, lame, withered, and other afflicted people; there was also lying there a man who had been suffering thirty-eight years from disabled limbs, and had at last come, perhaps from a great distance, hoping to get cured there, but had hitherto not found a compassionate hand

[1] To which reasons must be added the fact that, next to the Passover, we must most naturally suppose the autumnal feast intended when no other is specified. It is true that John vii. 2 adds ἡ σκηνοπηγία; but in that passage this more specific designation is more necessary for the context. If the reading ἡ ἑορτὴ were correct, we should on that account have to suppose the autumnal feast, because this feast only was according to ancient and recent custom thus absolutely called 'the feast' (see *Antiquities*, p. 356). If, finally, the *cd.* 131 John v. 1 adds ἡ σκηνοπηγία, that is, indeed, but a conjecture of an early reader, yet it is much more appropriate than the addition of τῶν ἀζύμων in a recently discovered MS., as the inventor of this reading by this very name used a different term for that feast than that by which John designates it.

[2] The Peshito writes this name as if it might signify בֵּית חֶסְדָּא, *house* of love, or *charité*; and John really takes the Hebrew name as an epithet, as if it were not a translation of the Greek word κολυμβήθρα, *bathing-place*; if it were the latter we might think of בֵּית אֶשְׁדָּא, *house of the water-emission*. Further, comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* viii. p. 255 [Sin. reads *Bethzatha*].

[3] Traces of this are still found in some of those waters. See *Jahrbb. der B. W.* v. p. 224.

[4] Ver. 4 is undoubtedly an addition by a later hand, which nevertheless quite correctly describes the popular belief which is here really intended, and must have been very early written in the margin of the Gospel. But some MSS., as if in order to protect themselves the more from the marginal words which were soon received into the text itself, also omitted the words ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν, ver. 3. That is no less an error, because then the words ver. 7 would become quite obscure.

to help him to get before the other sufferers as they pressed forward whenever the water rose. Jesus desired, as was to be expected from his present position and attitude, this time to avoid attracting general attention in any form; yet, seized with pity for the pitiable condition of the poor man, he healed him without making use of that semi-superstitious remedy, commanded him to take up his bed with his own hand and walk away, and then himself disappeared again intentionally in the crowd. But as it was a Sabbath the Judeans charged the cured sufferer with a violation of the Law, which prohibited a change of dwellings on the Sabbath, and they required that he should name the man who had commanded him to do that.[1] He was unable to find his benefactor. Probably only after some days Jesus met him again in the Temple, and then gave him general exhortations, which on the former occasion he had omitted, to take care of his restored health by a stricter life. Now for the first time the man named to his former accusers Jesus as the author of the advice which he then followed. But when called to account by them, Jesus defended himself as he was accustomed to do in the frequent similar cases of a charge of violating the Sabbath. As Messiah, however, he could in the increasing warmth of his discourse point to the fact that in such works of mercy, though performed on the Sabbath, he simply followed the example of his Father, who had not from the Creation ceased to work for the weal of man, not even on the Sabbath.[2]

This perfectly appropriate and incisive assertion, which was also a thoroughly logical refutation of their doubts, naturally provoked the more the wily hostility of the prejudiced Judeans, and, according to John, became the occasion of that very elaborate and definite exposition of the relation of Jesus as Messiah to God which constitutes the real burden of this piece of narrative. It must be allowed that in this unrestrained outflow of the deepest fundamental truths, as in all similar instances in this Gospel, the peculiar conception and colouring which have become spiritual characteristics of this Apostle

[1] We see also from Mark ii. 23–iii. 6 that just at that time violations of the Sabbath were very generally charged against the bold innovator. It appears also from a comparison of these passages, that John is accustomed to call the same people who are spoken of by Mark specifically as Pharisees by the more general name of Judeans simply.

[2] Undoubtedly the words John v. 17 are much more subtle and of themselves harder to be understood than the words Mark ii. 27, 28, iii. 4 which are likewise brief. As they stand here they can only be explained from the plan of the whole piece, inasmuch as their subtle brevity is intended to provoke the subsequent very lengthy discussion. However, the thought itself was certainly at some time thus uttered by Christ.

come the more prominently forward in proportion as the exhaustive presentation of such profound truths is difficult. And there are four of such truths which, as gathered up here in their necessary relation to each other, are required to fully state the position of Jesus. It is here shown (1) that the oneness of the will and the similarity of the work of the Messiah and of God are certain, but that they are found only in the highest work for the salvation of man; a salvation (2) which extends from the present moment into the utmost bounds of the general development of all human affairs, and which, marvellous and incredible as it may seem to be, is only all the more sure to appear; but (3) precisely on account of the perfect highest unity of the will and the work of the Messiah and of God for the eternal salvation of man, the ultimate, and in the end only decisive, witness for the truth of the Messiah must be his own divine mission, appearing, and work; although (4) even the Scriptures of the Judeans themselves, which were so exceedingly revered by them, could, when properly searched, and understood in their deepest sense and purpose, give sufficient witness to him.[1] But characteristically Johannine as the form is in which the four fundamental truths are here presented, the truths themselves were certainly part of the thought of Jesus, and were really everywhere taught by him in his words and works to the believing intelligent man. And at no time were they necessarily taught by him more plainly and distinctly, whenever a proper occasion arose, than at this very time, when, after the Baptist's removal from the scene, he had fully come forward as the Messiah, and had also to expound, calmly and comprehensively, the highest relations the solution of which was urgent.

3. *The opposition and the hostility of the world.*

We saw how strictly Jesus during this period everywhere, in the town where he ordinarily dwelt no less than in those

[1] The proper members of this discourse are therefore—(1) vv. 19–23; (2) vv. 24–30; (3) vv. 31–38; (4) vv. 39–47. The witness of God to him intended vv. 32, 37 is God's sending of him into the world, that he with his peculiar qualities is in it and works in it; he who has heard His voice, seen His form, and has His word remaining in him as no one else has (i. 18); he who is without a peer, and whose equal had never before existed, who on account of this unparalleled likeness to God can have received from no one but God himself a final, decisive witness, and with regard to whom the rest of mankind can on that very account only take up a position of belief or of rejection. What is then said with regard to the Scriptures vv. 39–47 is a final truth which is here expounded at the close as a suitable place, but to which there had been previously no reference in this discourse.

places where he made a shorter stay, and in Jerusalem no less than in Galilee, avoided making a public stir, and how constantly he observed the wise restriction which he had imposed upon himself. Not that he desired to impede the course and the publication of the truths which he proclaimed; not that he desired to repel the acknowledgment of his Messianic labours, when it came to him voluntarily without his interference, as the result of an inward movement and the beginning of a believing appreciation. But when he performed his works of help and healing he did everything to avoid attracting attention and not to promote the public excitement which precisely some unusual, and moreover such beneficent deeds would naturally cause; and thus he rendered assistance and performed his works of healing only when his inmost pity had been too powerfully stirred to permit him to withhold his hand, and he sought to withdraw himself and the fame of his labours from the notice of the world most in those places where he could most naturally suppose that fame would unnecessarily and injuriously get abroad. For he had to fear above everything a too early and harmful interruption of his great general work, and knew too certainly how easily such an arbitrary interruption of it could come from the rulers of his time. And this attitude he maintained, as we shall subsequently see, likewise during the immediately following stage of his general work.[1]

But still all his wise caution and restraint could not prevent the report of his deeds being more and more widely proclaimed, and the general attention being increasingly attracted to him. Moreover, his whole mode of acting was in fact so wholly different from that which was traditional; in his discourses and thoughts, too, there was constantly matter enough to painfully affect the prejudices of the age, and to arouse more and more strongly the antagonism of the world. It is true that the attention of the rulers of the country was during this period still not drawn to him in such a way that he must at once fear the worst from them; but the prevailing parties and schools of the time soon came in Galilee also into collision in the most various ways with his work and entire characteristics, and it was precisely they who must involuntarily feel themselves most profoundly threatened and most unexpectedly assailed by his mere existence and public work, and indeed by every one of his words and deeds. We saw previously some instances of his vainly seeking to avoid the more marked attention to his works and his words; and a very vivid and historically exceedingly instruc-

[1] See *Jahrbb. der B. W.* i. pp. 117 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 6 sq.].

tive picture of a multitude of such instances is drawn by the Gospel of Mark[1] in a continuous series of most expressive features, wherein we see how his words, habits, and deeds provoked the exasperated attention, and soon the censure and the jealousy, and indeed, the dangerous intentions of the prevailing parties.

When he returned after some time once more to his own house in Capernaum from the tour in Galilee before mentioned,[2] and his arrival had only just become known, so many assembled immediately that the wide space before his door was not large enough for them. Whilst he was then engaged in teaching this eager crowd from the window of his one-storeyed house, a man was brought who was so paralysed in his limbs that he had to be carried by four upon a slight bed; and inasmuch as it was impossible with the bed to get near the door on account of the crowd, he was carried by a flight of steps at the back of the house to the flat roof, which was no doubt furnished, as houses in those parts are, with a small upper chamber; here at a place at the back part of the roof his bearers removed the tiles, and thus let down the sick man upon his bed into the spacious room from the window of which Jesus was speaking to the people outside. This wish to be brought near the healing hand of Jesus, in spite of all the difficulties, was no doubt most felt by the sufferer himself; accordingly Jesus was the more touched with pity at the sight of such strong faith on the part of him and his kind bearers, and at once began the work of healing by inspiring the sufferer with that higher confidence in divine help and that comfort without the feeling of which none of his cures was ever effected. But he even announced at once to the man, which as we have seen he had authority to do,[3] the forgiveness of his sins, and this the more distinctly as those times suffered under the superstition, that everyone suffering from such an obstinate affliction must have been guilty of proportionately grievous sins.[4] But in the same room were sitting near enough some Scribes, listening with curiosity and inward suspicion to everything that he said; at first they did not at once express themselves with regard to the forgiveness of sins for which Jesus in this case also distinctly enough claimed authority, but he

[1] Mark ii. 1—iii. 6.
[2] *Ante*, p. 280.
[3] *Ante*, p. 232.
[4] This superstition, which is on one occasion so emphatically referred to by John, ix. 2, 3, 34, must be remembered at the same time in order to understand the full circumstances of this case; we see here, too, how admirably the Gospel of John completes the earlier narratives. Comp. on the superstition generally my Introduction to the *Book of Job*, English Translation (1882), pp. 1–16.

perceived plainly what was going on in their hearts. As true Scribes, or Biblical scholars, of the time they supposed undoubtedly (if we endeavour to follow their thoughts) that the sufferer ought previously to bring the sacrifices which had been prescribed in the Old Testament if he felt the burden of previous ill-desert or sin, that he might then receive from no one but the duly appointed priest absolution in the name of God; another absolution appeared to them accordingly nothing less than a usurpation of the divine prerogatives, and so far as the name of God was used in absolving, a blasphemy against God himself. To leave them in this error as regards his authority was not Christ's way; and as he on other occasions always refuted the error most directly by opposing to it not merely its antithesis but also the still higher and ultimate truth, thus conducting the matter in dispute by a correct forward movement to its truest conclusion, so now he at once openly asks them, which then is easier, to pronounce to an afflicted man the forgiveness of his sins or actually also to relieve him? immediately heals the sufferer before him, and commands him to take up his bed himself and straightway walk away with sound limbs. For all relief and strengthening of the spirit by the cheering assurance of fresh divine mercy and forgiveness can and should really only prepare a man that he may not be unworthy of the salvation and not miss it when it is about to come, and perhaps is already at hand; but this salvation itself is something of a higher nature, and even the power simply to prompt and in any way promote its coming is something higher than to declare the forgiveness of sins; this power is, wherever it is evinced and authenticated, a proof of that inner energy of the spirit which is in direct connection with the divine power itself and co-operates with it. By the most effective proof possible, therefore, were these scholars, in their invincible legal literalism, on this occasion refuted; and, as this narrative adds at the close, all the people standing around were astonished at the sight of this Messianic authority, and praised God who had given such new power to men; in fact it is implied in the primitive Christian feeling as something which too much follows from the nature of the case to need special remark, that the new higher powers of the Spirit, which were brought into the world by Christ and revealed first by him, were also preserved in his disciples and thus bring forth fruit a thousandfold.[1]

[1] The original close of this piece has therefore been certainly preserved in our present Matt. ix. 8 alone; it accords perfectly with Matt. x. 8 and other later passages, and moreover suits excellently the end of this account both as regards its matter and its place in the general connection of the Gospel.

If this time it was the lofty character of the action at which the Biblical scholars took offence and against which they could really do nothing, on other occasions it was habits and practices of his which appeared to them too low and unworthy, and to which they attached their astonishment and blame. One of these occasions was presented by his acceptance of an invitation to the house of that Levi to whom we have before referred.[1] On one of his new excursions into the neighbourhood of the Sea of Galilee he found Levi sitting at the custom-house, who then willingly obeyed his call and followed him. Perhaps on the evening of the day on which he had for the first time accompanied Jesus, Levi prepared for him in his house a feast, at which, in addition to the earlier disciples of Jesus, many publicans and others, likewise reputed to be 'sinners,' took part, some of whom therefore had been invited by the host, and some of whom were present because they had during the last days in other ways attached themselves to his society. At this feast the Biblical scholars and Pharisees could not repress their astonishment that he should eat with 'the sinners and publicans,' and openly blamed this conduct before his disciples. This was not the place to go into the question of the greater or less sinfulness of the publicans as compared with other men; accordingly he met the reproach simply with the general reference to the nature of his Messianic mission, according to which he had, in fact, come precisely to deliver men from the burden of their sins.

On another occasion, on the other hand, he was blamed for not adhering to the rules of fasting as they were observed in the schools of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees; it may then have been about the time just after the feast of Purim and before that of Easter, when fasting might on account of the season appear specially appropriate and have been introduced by the more rigorous schools.[2] This blame could be the more seriously meant and also received, inasmuch as it was known that he himself had originally, by his baptism and also in a certain sense by his teaching, passed through the school of the Baptist, as also some of his disciples had done. Moreover, the whole age inclined to this more gloomy rigorism; and precisely the school of the Baptist was at that time[3] much

[1] *Ante*, p. 277.

[2] The words Mark ii. 18 point to a particular time when the others fasted, and this censure was expressed; the censure would be most naturally uttered in connection with such customary annual fasts. From the position of this narrative also before the following one, and the supposed time (see *ante*, p. 281) of that, we may most naturally suppose the time of Easter.

[3] See *ante*, p. 167.

more serious and of much more youthful zeal than that of the Pharisees, with regard to such signs of a serious mind, so that the latter may have been at that time urged by the former to new zeal in this respect.[1] But if it was generally accordant with Christ's view to leave such exercises and signs of more serious godliness to the free impulses of the spirit, he now, in addition, reminded his censors with the greater propriety of the special character of the period in which they were living, when his disciples, gathered around their Master and the Messiah, might the more reasonably, as on a marriage day, turn to the brighter side of life, as it was certain that after his departure they would have also to resign themselves to gloomy sorrow. And as regards the views of the disciples of John in particular, he described them by appropriate figures as wanting in thoroughness and as self-contradictory, inasmuch as consistently they must really desire actually and fully the new and therefore Messianic things, with their luminous glory, cheerfulness, and joy; while they really adhered to the things of the past, with their principle of gloomy compulsion, and thus sought to unite incongruous things which were necessarily self-contradictory.[2]

This was almost the sole occasion on which he came into any close contact with the disciples of John; at other times he, on the contrary, evidently endeavoured to hinder these two still weak shoots of the same noble trunk from coming into any unhappy contact with each other; and even after the imprisonment of the Baptist he silently tolerated the labours of John's disciples by the side of his own; as we have seen,[3] it was very infrequently that the adherents of the two schools had any controversy with each other. But the other schools of the day soon charged him with all kinds of things in his habits and his works which were considered to be in direct violation of the ordinary practice of the existing laws. On a Sabbath, some fourteen days after Easter,[4] just when some of the earliest fields of corn, particularly of barley, might be ripe, his disciples as they walked through them plucked some of the ears for immediate eating; this was permitted to the hungry

[1] It is not accidental that Mark ii. 18, comp. Matt. ix. 14, the disciples of John are twice placed before the Pharisees.

[2] The words Mark ii. 21, 22, are in so far not inappropriate in this place, but they are only loosely connected, and have quite the appearance of having been transferred hither from the Collected Sayings.

[3] *Ante*, p. 263.

[4] The expression *the second-first Sabbath*, Luke vi. 1, is properly and intelligibly formed, since between Easter and the Mo-aic Pentecost there intervened precisely seven Sabbaths, which could thus be easily distinguished from the middlemost one of their series. Comp. *σάββατον πρῶτον* in Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5. 41.

by the Law,[1] but the Pharisees complained that this was done in violation of that particular sacred law which commands that nothing that is necessary for food shall be taken on the Sabbath, but everything must be got ready before. He refuted them on that occasion both by examples from history and the nature of the case: the Sabbath, he said, exists for the sake of man, not man for the Sabbath; man was not created simply to serve the Sabbath as the highest law of life which must in no case be violated, just as he must serve God; and as it is cruel to condemn the innocent, so the Messiah is authorised, as such, to remove also the rigour of the existing law when this tends to destroy even the highest divine laws concerning compassion and mercy.[2]

If we now sum up all the charges which the world laid against him, and which had already all of them become so established that in this respect nothing really new is added to them in the subsequent periods of his public work, we find that it was substantially only two matters with regard to which the existing Hagiocracy could then take offence, according to the laws of the true religion as they were at that time understood and applied. For it could not seriously be made a charge against him, that he had in view the Messianic kingdom and spoke of the Consummation of the kingdom of God, or indeed (as gradually became generally known) that he did not absolutely refuse Messianic homage when it was voluntarily offered to him; inasmuch as the Messianic hope formed a part of the treasure of the ancient sacred hopes of Israel, and moreover everyone saw that he did not intend to establish any ordinary kingdom. If the general undertaking of his public work, in the way in which he carried it out, had been in itself wholly unallowable, particularly in the Community of the true religion, which after all could not be ignored by the Hagiocracy, we may be sure that it would not have been tolerated so long.

It was therefore, first, only the forgiveness of sins at which a legal offence could be taken.[3] But as far as the Law expressly prescribed certain offerings in case of anyone who had to be purified, for instance, a leper, Jesus in the case of all whom he healed,[4] insisted upon the fulfilment of the legal obligation. Spiritual admonition and consolation, however, could be administered by every member of the Community of true religion

[1] See *Antiquities*, p. 186.

[2] The words Matt. xii. 3–8 are therefore put together in part from Mark and in part from the Collected Sayings; at least the second example, vv. 5, 6, has every appearance of having been taken from the latter, and the saying ver. 7 was at all events not read by Luke in Mark.

[3] See *ante*, p. 287.

[4] See *ante*, p. 280.

to others, in conformity with its fundamental principle; and the wholly new and characteristic manner in which Jesus did this, was of a piece with his Messianic undertaking which could not be objected to. Therefore neither on this head could any just ground be found, notwithstanding the ill-will of the Hagiocracy, for a legal punishment. Secondly, it was specially the Sabbatical laws in the exceedingly subtle refinement that they had reached with regard to which the Scribes learnt to lie in wait for him. And it cannot be denied that this was a region full of traps and snares. Since the foundation of the Community of the true religion the Sabbath had grown into its most characteristic and highest sacrament; subsequently, in these later times, it had, in accordance with their peculiar character, been most scrupulously further developed, and was regarded as the true distinctive sign of a genuine Judean, which must be visible in every place on the earth.[1] But just because in this law, as it was then administered, the entire perversity of that development of the true religion was specially represented, he might least of all on this point yield to the prejudices and injurious practices of the schools. Accordingly it is precisely this matter that gave rise to a number of disputes, which become indeed from much more important causes continually more decisive, and with which the whole history of his public work is full.

Thus Mark mentions a similar occurrence which ended worse, and for the first time showed him what a terrible amount of indignation had already been gathered against him on the part of his enemies even in Galilee. As on one occasion, on having returned to Capernaum from one of his circuits in Galilee, he had entered the Synagogue on the Sabbath, there appeared before him, seeking his help, a man with a seriously distorted and withered hand: but he observed how the Pharisees, who were already lying in wait for him, watched to see whether he, in spite of their repeated remonstrances, would again desecrate the Sabbath by an act of healing, that is, according to their opinion, by a piece of labour. Instead of heeding them he on the contrary told the sufferer to come forward quite openly before their eyes, asked them whether it was forbidden to do good and to save on the Sabbath day, or the contrary,[2] grew greatly indignant at them as they, in

[1] See *Antiquities*, pp. 103 sq., 168 sq.; also vol. v. pp. 196 sq.

[2] Here also Matt. xii. 11, 12, prefers to insert an appropriate saying of some length from the Collected Sayings, and, on the other hand, does not here adopt the brief, pointed saying from Mark.

the ill-feeling and obduracy which they had long secretly cherished towards him, refused even so much as to give answer to his quite necessary question, but threatened, if he nevertheless determined to heal the man, to publicly accuse him before the Synedrion, and then healed the hand of the man at once, seized with pity for him and with profound grief at them. The Pharisees, however, departed then immediately with declared hostility; and soon it became known that they, with their own enemies, the Herodians,[1] laid a plan for his destruction. The Pharisees, who were proud of their moral and legal purity, from whose midst the Zealots of the Law,[2] who deprecated every form of human monarchy, had gone forth, and who were all along in danger of getting amalgamated again with the latter, now united with those who were rather their direct opponents than their friends, namely, the royalists, who were morally indifferent and flatterers of the Herodean family, and united with them for no other reason than that they were at that time powerful enough in Galilee to destroy him whose character and work must become to them every week more and more incomprehensible and alarming!

The first outbreak of unequivocal deadly hostility may have happened in the late summer of this year: probably he then went with the more determination to Jerusalem for the above-mentioned[3] autumn feast, that meanwhile the kindled rage of his Galilean enemies might cool down. But in Jerusalem also he became involved, in spite of all his reserve, in the very similar contention above described[4] concerning Sabbath-breaking: and this contention ended likewise with the same exasperation of the people of the Law, so that they there also already laid plans for his complete destruction.[5] In both parts of his Judean fatherland therefore he was now already openly threatened with the danger of death, in spite of all his wise caution and reserve; and as he could, quite otherwise than the Baptist, be charged with having violated the most sacred thing itself, a fatal issue might easily be foreseen by himself.[6]

According to all indications, at least the suspension of the smaller excommunication over him, or his expulsion from the Synagogue, took place thus early, under the allegation that by the violation of the laws of the Sabbath he had rendered himself unfit to teach and to appear in the Synagogue. It was the

[1] See *ante*, pp. 73 sq.
[2] See *ante*, pp. 47 sq.
[3] Pp. 281 sq.
[4] Pp. 283 sq.
[5] John v. 18: ἀποκτείνειν is a favourite word in the vocabulary of this Gospel; comp. vii. 1, 19, 20, 25; viii. 37, 40; xi. 53; xii. 10; xvi. 2.
[6] As he intimates Mark ii. 20 also quite early.

mildest punishment which it was in Jerusalem supposed could then be employed against him, and under which for the present was concealed the mortal hatred which had accumulated against him in Jerusalem. The Gospel of John[1] intimates very clearly that the Pharisees about this time succeeded in passing, and first in Jerusalem, such a measure against him; and the circumstance is implied in the subsequent development of the course of this history as it had now become inevitable. The measure appeared to its authors undoubtedly by no means stringent. The smaller excommunication was in force only for one particular synagogue, and we accordingly find Christ appearing subsequently for a considerable time in the synagogues of Galilee;[2] further, it could after a time be cancelled. Still it was severe particularly in the case of Jesus, as they regarded his position, inasmuch as they knew how much he had hitherto spoken and worked precisely in the synagogues, and how much value he set upon this form of public work.[3] And, moreover, the example set by the synagogue of the capital could easily be imitated by the other synagogues.

The new attitude of the Messiah towards the unbelieving world.

But in fact it was not even that fatal issue as regards his own person which Christ feared, or sought in any way to avoid, or the necessity of which could now first in any way have filled his mind with alarm: we have seen[4] that he must have made himself familiar with this thought from the very beginning of his Messianic labours. The one thing which he had now justly to fear, was the premature interruption and destruction of his work in the world itself: for it had but just been properly and seriously commenced, was very far from being finished, least of all in such a way that he himself might already think of withdrawing his hand from it.

And one thing had been unmistakably taught by the events of the last year: that the world as it was would not tolerate him, or rather his work, and indeed was determined to crush it

[1] The words and incidental observations John vii. 1, 13, 20; ix. 22, 34, 35; xii. 42, must be accurately understood and compared together to get the meaning of the Apostle in this narrative; comp. also Matt. xxiii. 34. To this must be added that I still hold completely by what I have said *Die Johanneischen Schriften*, vol. i. pp. 220 sq., regarding a considerable hiatus in this Gospel between ch. v. and ch. vi., [occasioned probably by the accidental loss of a part of the manuscript].

[2] According to John vi. 59; Mark vi. 2.

[3] According to Mark i. 21 sq. 39; iii. 1; Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35; Luke xiii. 10; John xviii. 20.

[4] P. 240.

in the germ. If therefore he was nevertheless bent on not permitting this work to be destroyed by the world, just as it had been scarcely properly founded, he was now obliged to put it before it in another manner, in order to make it indestructible in spite of his own expected violent end. And the proper means for effecting this could not be matter of doubt.

His work was the founding and commencement of the perfected kingdom of God in the life of men: but this actual founding of it could not be effected except in a Community suited to it, which should gather around him as its founder and visible head. This Community must from the very first become quite a different one from the Community of the true religion which was then in existence: for that the latter as it had hitherto been was incapable of reformation, and on that account had already been hopelessly abandoned to its own fate, had been as plainly as possible taught by the experience of the last year, and was regarded by him, if by no one else, as an unalterable Divine certainty. And yet after all, as his experience had likewise sufficiently taught, it was strictly only the heads of this past Community of the true God, or rather, to state the matter most precisely, it was only the tendency in it that had for centuries been growing predominant, which could not tolerate even the undisturbed beginning, much less the happy progress of his work, and which, because it already vaguely felt itself mortally assailed by him, began thus early seriously to meditate his destruction. But it is true that this tendency which had now become quite predominant in the ancient Community, had not attained to this supreme influence accidentally or for the passing moment: it had always lain latent in the imperfection of the ancient Community, had now at last arrived in it at its fullest development and predominance as one of the most deeply rooted forms of it which had succeeded many others, and at this very time was so exclusively and irresistibly predominant, as the most dangerous impulse in the Community, that its existence constituted the very basis of the existence of the whole Community as it had hitherto been, and its destruction threatened to involve also the destruction of the entire Community of all true religion. If therefore it was really only a special tendency, or party, as it had at length attained supreme influence in the past Community of the true God, which now mortally threatened Christ's work, and not really the Community itself with its wealth of eternal truths and influences, which were now only somewhat fallen into decay and gloom,—truths and influences without which the Messiah himself could

not have arisen and laboured as he had already done,—it was quite consistent and necessary that he should found his own new Community, when the time came that he must do this in order that his work might not again be lost, not outside the ancient Community, but within it and upon it as its basis. In that Community alone had the living stones been supplied which could form the firm corners and pillars of this new house that had now become necessary; and, indeed, he had himself already insensibly shaped them for his purpose upon this ancient sacred territory, and could now select them at the right moment as they were best adapted for him.

If this Divine necessity, in the form in which it was now required by precisely this development of his entire work, was perfectly clear to his mind, his entire past labours also necessarily thereby received a new attitude and direction. He must now simply draw around him a small most close and intimate, though sufficiently large, circle of disciples, and in and for it prosecute with still greater devotion and energy than before, if possible, that work which was the essence of his whole life and labours. If the world generally still remained too hostile, and the ancient Community of the true God also was still too weak to at once receive into itself his spirit, it was necessary that he should labour the more unreservedly and energetically to render that spirit a perfectly living and native force, at least in the circle immediately about himself, of a new Community of the same true God, in order that in the future it might at the right time irresistibly spread through the world at large from the narrow confines in which it was necessitated at first to hide, if it was to find anywhere upon the earth a secure dwelling-place. And on this account it is now that the entire activity of Christ is first unfolded in its full exaltation and glory: just when it is already so publicly threatened by the world, and has constantly in view this opposition as it has already been publicly brought out, it founds all the more surely and clearly that immortal work which the whole world could not again overthrow; and in the midst of the constantly increasing outward straitening and voluntary limitation, this activity becomes the most absorbing and intense, as well as the most mighty and victorious, that the earth has ever witnessed.

However, as the whole progress of the work of Christ, as we have hitherto followed it, has all along been closely connected with the course of the work and history of the Baptist, so now there occurred in the latter also a decisive crisis which must have contributed essentially in leading Christ now to

adopt this new attitude. The Baptist had now been a year in unbroken imprisonment, his work more and more seriously interrupted; and that he would not again get free to continue it Christ could foresee without difficulty: and as a fact the first initiator of the Messianic movement soon afterwards met his end. If that life-work of the Baptist was now already as good as completely destroyed, Christ must necessarily feel the more powerfully stimulated to carry forward his own to the highest stage possible. Thus everything combined to urge him to assume this new position.

The founding of the Christian Community.

It was apparently accidental that Jesus now drew precisely twelve of his disciples into his constant and closer intimacy, and trained them to become the foundation of the new Community: he could not very well have chosen a much smaller number, since in every community, however small it may be at first, there must be a certain variety of tendencies and activities, if it is to last and expand. And as in his case the free act of the spirit and a higher necessity are everywhere found co-operating in the most marvellous unison, and the first always coincides again with the second, the same thing occurs in this instance also. In these twelve, a number (as has been sufficiently shown in the previous volumes of this History)[1] which was from of old sacred in Israel for all national and public relations and offices, and which presented an unsought for reference to the earliest origin and the eternal significance of Israel, there had been supplied in the midst of the ancient Community the smallest and yet the adequate and firmest foundation of a new Community, in which the old one, if it must perish, could nevertheless be perpetuated and rise again rejuvenated as by the wholly indestructible power of a second immortal life.

As we have above seen,[2] it was probably in the late autumn of this year when Jesus resolved to take up this new attitude. He had then just returned from the feast in Jerusalem, and in the first instance betook himself with his earlier disciples again to the lake district of Galilee. But a constantly growing multitude already attended him into this region: from Judea and Jerusalem also where he had just been,[3] and from Idumea in

[1] [E.g. vol. i. pp. 363 sq.]

[2] Pp. 281 sq., 292 sq.

[3] The express mention of these southern Judeans and of the Scribes from Jerusalem, Mark iii. 7, 8, 22, serves as a confirmation of the date of the journey to Jerusalem as it has been fixed above by other considerations: by nothing else could he have at that time become so well known even in the most

the furthest south, as well as from the Phœnician region in the furthest north-west, and from the parts beyond the Jordan. Here he continued his previous daily labours, as they have been above described, constantly so greatly besieged and pressed by those needing his help that he commissioned his four earliest disciples to keep a small boat in readiness upon the Lake, that he might at least for a few brief moments remain in it alone and unmolested.

It was undoubtedly more compassion for the multitude than anything else which now induced him after his return to devote himself for a short time at first wholly to his previous daily labours, in order that he might minister to the sufferers of all kinds who were waiting for him. But he seized the first suitable moment to carry out that which he had recognised as now his necessary and higher work. In earlier times he had probably withdrawn, when he desired to be more alone for a somewhat longer time, to a line of hills which lay on the west of the Lake of Galilee, and probably not so very far from Capernaum.[1] Into this quieter solitude he now betook himself again, but this time invited the same twelve men to accompany him who were henceforth to form the firm group of a community of followers. Undoubtedly he had previously known them all; and he selected these only from a much larger number of such as would probably as gladly have followed all his wishes, because these twelve appeared to him the best fitted for the higher object which he had now in view.[2]

The motives and his knowledge of the men which guided Jesus in the reception of disciples have been considered above[3] in some aspects. Many came to him of their own accord, many he encouraged by a personal call, he retained no one whom his own voluntary resolve did not constantly hold loyal. When he was more widely known and his fame had spread, and his cause appeared to promise, at all events in a somewhat distant future, all kinds of obscurely longed-for blessings, many constantly flocked to him with the request for a more intimate share in his work; but no one immediately perceived so clearly

southern parts of the country as by that journey to the feast. And the entire narrative Mark iii. 7–12 conveys the impression that there must have been precisely at this point a more than usually important turn in the life of Jesus.

[1] This is 'the mountain' which the first time it occurs in Mark, iii. 13, is thus briefly mentioned, is subsequently repeatedly intended in the following pieces, and in Matt. v. 1 also still remains without nearer definition. Undoubtedly the mountain was then regarded as well known, since it was really the holy mountain of the Gospel history. Comp. further *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 238 note, 2nd ed.

[2] It is said significantly, Mark iii. 13, 'He invited to him those *whom he himself would*.'

[3] Pp. 244 sq., 275 sq.

as he the deeper motives of the man that presented himself as a follower, or repulsed so severely by the most suitable word the ineligible petitioners and their perverse notions. Even the oldest Evangelical work presents in one connection three examples of this kind which may serve for all the rest.[1] To a learned man, who offered to follow him everywhere, he presented the great dangers involved in following one who had not on the earth where he might lay his head; and thereby probably quenched for ever the too hasty zeal of the scholarly man who was habituated to worldly honour and convenience. To another, whose zeal was evidently more serious, but who requested that he might be allowed first to bury his father who had just died, he replied, that the dead had their own realm and their own characteristics and cares; that he must let the dead bury their own dead, and he himself be employed for the kingdom of God forthwith, without any further care and anxiety about the world, as well as without any interval of delay; that in that kingdom there was no death and no care, which must after all be vain, for the dead, but that everything connected with it was full of life and must become in the future still more so:[2] and thereby he undoubtedly stimulated the good earnest man, who had but a few smaller scruples to overcome, to make the bold venture to proclaim the truth in the midst of the full life of the world and to labour for it alone. A third, who, when asked by him whether he desired to follow him, expressed the wish that he might be allowed first to say farewell to those he had at home, he pointed to the fact that no one who laid his hand as on the plow and yet looked backwards, who therefore was but half a man in determination and work, was fitted for the kingdom of God; and he undoubtedly by this stern reproof at once got rid of a follower who would never have adhered to him with all his heart.

Thus the number of his less intimate followers grew, and thus was it diminished. And if an early tradition fixes the

[1] The passage from this work has been preserved more fully Luke ix. 57–62, where alone the third example is given, than Matt. viii. 19–22, although in Matt. some details have been better preserved. The third example, when more closely examined, suits perfectly this connection, and is not the same as the first as regards its occasion, nor as the second as regards its meaning and probable issue.

[2] The short proverbial phrase about the burying of the dead undoubtedly says nothing more than that the dead belong to the dead, the living to the living; that the former as much as the latter constitute of themselves a class and a community, and that therefore these two realms must not be confounded, and to each of these two realms must be left the care for itself and its members. The application of the phrase is open to everyone; but care must be taken not to wrest a single word of the phrase from its connection and import into it a foreign meaning. The Pythagorean phrase in *Jamblicus, De Pythagorica Vita* (ed. Kiessling, Lipsiæ, 1815), cap. xvii. (73 sq.) is foreign to our passage.

number of those who nevertheless more faithfully cleaved to him, and who, although never in more than a general voluntary association with him, would probably have gladly followed him everywhere, at seventy,[1] this estimate may be approximately correct,[2] but the formation itself of this number of such disciples, and their somewhat more definite introduction into the Gospel history, belong to the somewhat later time of this class of narrative and literature.[3]

It is quite otherwise with the Twelve, whose peculiarly great significance appears so prominently both in the earlier Gospels, and in John, and elsewhere in the earliest Christian literature, and first in Luke retreats somewhat behind the Seventy, who are mentioned by him only. The Twelve were selected from the larger circle of disciples, and were intended to be received as no other disciples permanently into the nearest and closest intimacy with Jesus. It was to them he meant to communicate his whole spirit and cause it to flow forth upon them in its purest measure, as far as a living teacher and leader is capable of doing this in the case of his closest disciples and friends. His purpose was to make the whole deep insight and calm assurance no less than the entire elevation of the invincible ardour and enthusiasm of his spirit the possession of these men; and the unwearied activity of his healing love he designed should become the sweet and blessed habit of their lives. And inasmuch as all this could be attained only by practice and personal essays, he sought to send them forth as soon as possible as partners in his own work, that they might learn to promote the kingdom of God both by preaching and teaching and by the power of active healing and assistance; and that they might become accustomed without his immediate presence to live and to labour just as if he himself were always with them. Indeed, this sending of them forth themselves to work for the kingdom of God must appear to him one chief point of their whole mission, so that he undoubtedly himself also soon distinguished them from the rest of his disciples by the name of *Apostles*. But in so far as especially and everywhere, whether they were employed in his presence or on his commissions far from him, they were intended to form an inner circle around him as their teacher and leader, firmly held together by voluntary love to him and his work, and also by

[1] Luke x. 1–24; comp. further on the Seventy, vol. vi. [German].

[2] Inasmuch as Luke wrote at a time when everything of this kind could still be generally reviewed without difficulty. The tradition that the Baptist had thirty disciples, see *ante*, p. 172, is of a wholly different kind.

[3] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 350 sq.

their loyalty and faith, he gradually constructed in them the foundation of a new Community, which, small and weak as it might be at first, could nevertheless become the indestructible beginning of a Community of the perfected true religion which was destined to embrace the whole world.

It was therefore exceedingly important that these Twelve should be men worthy of their vocation, capable of being moulded by their Master, and generally excellent persons[1]; and the whole following history proves how little Christ was mistaken in his choice of them. He necessarily chose them from the circle of the disciples who had already adhered to him: they had already been given to him. He evidently preferred to select his first disciples, who had long been most intimate with him, as far as they appeared suited for the new and difficult vocation; and then he chose from them who began to follow him somewhat later those whom he had perceived to be the most willing and able. In making his choice he did not consider previous position and vocation, or wealth and other externalities; neither, indeed, marriage, or the contrary, for Peter had been married from the beginning,[2] and perhaps one or another of the rest,[3] though certainly not all of them. The fact that they were not more taken from the scholarly profession[4] arose from the circumstance that the learning and attitude of this profession itself had at that time become entirely false. Just as the Messiah and his work could least of all proceed from the schools, offices, and authorities which then prevailed, but only from the lowest basis of the entire ancient Community, which had alone remained more free from the errors of the time and more receptive for the eternal truths and hopes of Israel, so he also found upon this basis alone the first proper stones and pillars for the construction of his new Community. Yet several of the Twelve, as we have seen, had been in the school of the Baptist; another came from that of the Zealots of the Law, as his surname name, *Kananites*,

[1] It is true that the Epistle of Barnabas, ch. v. says that when Christ chose them they had been ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομώτεροι; and Celsus (comp. Origen *contra Cel.* i. 63) repeats this from Barnabas with great parade. But in fact all that is worth examining in this statement is the source from which the Epistle derived such an extravagant idea. It appears from his own words that the author did not derive it merely from the words Matt. ix. 13 [which Ewald, however, himself infers; vol. vii. p. 160 [German]]. But he might find this exaggeration in one of the earliest Gnostic Gospels; the passage therefore simply supplies another proof that such Gospels were written very early and were favourably received.

[2] See *ante*, p. 279.

[3] According to the belief of the Armenian Church, all excepting the two sons of Zebedee and Thomas were regarded as married. See the extracts in the *Journal Asiat.* 1867, p. 163 sq.

[4] Comp. Acts iv. 13 and the remarks thereupon, *ante*, p. 189.

probably shows: and, indeed, according to the ancient constitution of Israel all its members had equally free access to all the deepest truths and the highest aims of the Community. Of the powers and the exclusive privileges of the ancient priestly tribe, moreover, there had now long since been preserved in Israel only a few remnants, which had but little significance for the higher spiritual life of the people; the ancient tribe of Levi itself, which had never been too rigorously separated from the rest of the nation, had now been almost completely lost in the nation generally; yet there were some amongst the Twelve (as we saw above[1]) who were of priestly descent. Similarly the Twelve were generally without much wealth, though there were some amongst them belonging to well-to-do families,[2] and the publican Matthew had undoubtedly as such not been poor.

Every one of this group became a man whose name was not again lost among men, and whose memory in later times was constantly extended further in the wide world. Yet there soon appeared great distinctive differences amongst them, according as either Christ himself distinguished some of them partly as his earliest intimate associates, or as the course of time brought out particularly the measure of their activity and their faithfulness. Thus in that age which we are now accustomed to call the Apostolic age, there was established somewhat early a definite order in which the names of the Twelve were generally recorded; and in such series of names the surnames also were generally mentioned with which it was customary to distinguish the different Apostles according to expressions by which Christ himself had characterised them. This order in which the Twelve were enumerated remained always the same in its most essential features: only smaller departures from it were perhaps allowed.

At the head the two pairs of brothers, who, as we have seen,[3] had been the first disciples and also always very intimate friends of Christ, were always named. And of these again Simon, who was, as we have seen,[4] early surnamed *Cephas* or *Peter*, was placed first: distinguished by his age, his quiet steadfastness and decision, and also by his readiness in speech and daring amongst men, no less than by a special confidence in him on the part of Christ himself, he was soon looked upon as *primus inter pares*, and always retained also in subsequent times this voluntary high consideration on the part of his fellow-

[1] P. 185.
[2] See *ante*, pp. 275 sq.
[3] *Ante*, pp. 244 sq.
[4] P. 245.

Apostles. In immediate connection with him his younger brother[1] Andrew, who also always remained intimately connected with Jesus and enjoyed freer approach to him,[2] was it is true often named, yet it was preferred to insert another pair of brothers between the names of these two brothers—the sons of Zebedee, of whom the younger one, John, was regarded as especially the favourite of the Lord, whilst this Apostle himself always gave the preference to his older brother James, and both together were also regarded as very intimate friends of Christ's.[3] The two were unmarried, but attended by their equally zealous mother (who has been further mentioned above),[4] and were by disposition the most fiery of the four: but Christ once checked their too violent zeal by addressing them, 'Ye sons of thunder,' a name which was never afterwards forgotten, instead of calling them sons of Zebedee after their father, who was probably then dead. This perhaps occurred on that occasion of which mention is still preserved in the earliest Gospel document, when they had suffered themselves in a Samaritan village to be so far misled as to wish to call down fire from heaven upon its inhospitable inhabitants;[5] he could then most appropriately at once exclaim, 'Ye sons of thunder, do ye not know of what spirit ye are?' that is, not of such a thunder-spirit as ye are still in this case manifesting, but of a wholly different spirit which I have taught you, and which ye ought to be better acquainted with.

The other eight were early likewise divided into groups of four to each: and at the head of each of these two groups the same name always occurred, whilst the position of the rest in their respective groups at times varied. Those four which were always brought together after the first group, according to all appearance, really followed immediately the first four in point of capacity and other excellences.[6] Philip, who is always at the head of the group, belonged likewise, as we have seen,[7] to the earliest disciples, and is mentioned elsewhere also as distinguished, although as somewhat slow of understanding;[8]

[1] It is not clear why later writers (Epiph. *Hær.* li. 17) regard him as older than Peter.

[2] Comp. John vi. 8, xii. 22 with Mark xiii. 3.

[3] It is true that these three appear already in Mark v. 37, ix. 2, xiv. 33, as the most intimate friends of Jesus, but Andrew also still appears xiii. 3, comp. iii. 17, 18 with them in similar circumstances.

[4] P. 181.

[5] Luke ix. 52–56, comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 350.

[6] John still mentions them all except Matthew at suitable places, whilst of the last group he names the traitor almost alone; see especially John xxi. 2.

[7] P. 247.

[8] John vi. 5–7, xii. 21, 22, xiv. 8, 9; it is quite evident that John describes him as very much resembling Thomas.

Bartholomew, who is always[1] named in the second place, is the Nathanael above described,[2] who was added as the first of the disciples obtained in Galilee. Matthew, who occupies the third place in this group, is now known to us only by the Gospel which bears his name: according to this Gospel[3] he was a publican, and his call was narrated so much like that of Levi the son of Alphæus above mentioned,[4] that his name was simply substituted for that of Levi in the Gospel called after him in the narrative in question, without doubt because the last author of this Gospel was more particularly acquainted with the circumstances of his life, and deemed it worth while to make also the readers of this Gospel, which was still chiefly traced back to him, more particularly acquainted with them. The honest Thomas, or according to the Greek translation of his name, Didymus,[5] who, however, was not easily convinced of the truth of higher things, was, according to many indications, one of the earliest disciples; in the earlier lists he closes the group of these four, but after repeated revision of the whole list of the Twelve he was removed into the second, and even into the third place.[6]

We know comparatively least of the four of the last group, of whom Judas son of Simon,[7] who is usually called after his birthplace, 'the man of Karioth,'[8] already occupies, as the

[1] Luke only, in his second work, Acts i. 13, removes him to the third place: inasmuch as this coincides in his case, precisely in this latter work, with the removal of Matthew to the fourth place, and the latter change of position is found quite independently in the Gospel of Matthew, it would seem that subsequently the chronological order of the call of these four was really more particularly examined, and it was found that of these four Philip was first called, next Thomas, then Bartholomew, and lastly Matthew. If this result had been thus presented in a document of those days, the last author of the Gospel of Matthew no less than Luke could take it into account; but the latter adopted the correction in his later work only, undoubtedly because he was not earlier acquainted with it.

[2] See p. 248.

[3] Matt. ix. 9, x. 3: the alterations in both of these passages [comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 247, 255] are manifestly intentional; but it is equally clear that they were made by the hand of the last author of the Gospel, since the Apostle Matthew himself would not have been satisfied with such slight changes. The name מַתָּאִי *Gem. Jer.*, חגיגה ii. 2, is the better reading instead of נתאי; מַתִּיָא *Matθίas*, *M.* שקלים, v. 1 is another word; the latter is probably abbreviated from מַתִּתְיָה, the former from מַתַּנְיָה.

[4] P. 277.

[5] That is, *the Twin*, John xi. 16, xx. 26 sq., xxi. 2.

[6] Into the third in Matthew, but into the second by Luke in the Acts only, i. 13.

[7] As 'son of Simon' he is more definitely designated by John only, vi. 71 (xii. 4), xiii. 2, 26; and we see at the same time from John's language that his father also was called Iscarioth, which is easily intelligible from the proper understanding of this name.

[8] According to the *Pirqe Aboth* also, it was a frequent custom of those times to designate a man's birthplace by such compounds with אִישׁ. The place Karioth itself is hardly that in the tribe of Juda, Josh. xv. 25; he would in that case have been the only Apostle not a Galilean, which is contrary to all other evidence; but it might rather be the same as the קְרִיָּתָה Josh. xxi. 34, in the tribe of Zebulon, or another northern place.

subsequent traitor, the last place. All four belonged probably to the disciples who had come somewhat later into connection with Christ: and the most distinguished amongst them must in this case also have been the one always mentioned first, James the son of Alphæus, who was probably, as we have seen,[1] a younger brother of Levi then referred to. He is undoubtedly the same Apostle who is elsewhere called James the Less, in distinction from James the son of Zebedee, and whose mother took such a specially lively interest in the cause of Christ;[2] so that we have probably in this instance before us a family all of whose members were believers. As the third in the earlier lists appears a Simon with the surname *Kananites*,[3] which is now somewhat obscure, although its most probable meaning is that given above.[4] The Apostle, who is placed according to these earlier lists in the second place, is as regards his real name likewise somewhat obscure; he was probably properly called Lebbæus, as the last author of the present Gospel of Matthew explains, but had the surname Thaddæus, which alone appears in Mark. Instead of him, however, Luke has in both his books an evidently quite different *Judas of James*, but in the third place: and we can scarcely refrain from supposing that this Apostle had in the Apostolic age, and indeed while Jesus was still living, perhaps because Thaddæus had died early, been received into the number of the Twelve and came gradually to be regarded as if he had been chosen by Christ from the first. In that case precisely this name becomes the more significant.[5]

[1] P. 277.

[2] According to the indications Mark xv. 40, xvi. 1.

[3] Luke, in both his books, uses instead of it, the Greek word 'Zelotes,' and we should then have in קַנָּאִי, probably the historical name of the Zealots of the Law above (pp. 50 sq.) described. In fact it cannot be denied that the name may have been formed like *Φαρισαῖος* [see vol. v. p. 369], and one who had previously been in that school might have very well gone over to the school of Christ. It is true that as yet we do not possess any other proofs that that school had precisely at that time any existence worth mentioning: as we have seen, pp. 50 sq., it flourished earlier, and emerged again subsequently, but appears at that time to have generally preferred to put itself under the shelter of the name of the Pharisees. We might, therefore, also conjecture that the name perhaps originally signified a man of the Kana above, pp. 180, referred to; but then we should expect from the analogy of the formation of such names *Καναδαῖος*. And in fact the continued existence of the school of the Zealots of the Law in, at all events, a precarious condition during that time is not to be denied, as we soon see the Apostle Paul also coming from it.

[4] *Ante*, p. 300.

[5] The name would most naturally mean 'Judas the *son* of James,' but it could also mean 'Judas the *brother* of James,' if this James was well known. And the fact that Luke omits the passage concerning the brothers of Jesus, Mark vi. 1–6, Matt. xiii. 53–58, and indeed intentionally substitutes for it another piece, according to the remarks in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 302, might favour the view that by this name he really meant Judas, the author of the Epistle. However, according to John xiv. 22, he was during the lifetime of Jesus one of the Twelve, at all events towards the end of his life: probably, therefore, the other Apostle had in the meantime died; and thus the most

Since this circle of more intimate disciples and constant attendants thus already formed with their Lord and Master a small independent society, or rather Community,[1] it is not surprising that the most necessary business and duties of the Community were soon more particularly divided amongst them and precisely determined. The chief quarters of the society, if one may so say, were fixed at Capernaum, where probably the house of Jesus, and that of Peter also, always stood open to its members. If the society rose in order to journey to another place and to stay there for a time, messengers were despatched from it to arrange beforehand for lodgings.[2] The expenses of the sustenance of the Community were borne partly by the more wealthy members, and came partly from the voluntary gifts of such as took a deeper interest in its work. Judas Iscariot was charged with the care and constant expenditure of the society's funds.[3] When feminine care and help was necessary, there were certain women who gladly served the society, some of them relatives of its members, others less closely connected with it, everything being done without restraint, and only as the higher love to a common word and work demanded.[4]

natural force of the name remains the most probable. The M'pharsho John xiv. 22 has *Judas Thomas*, as if this Judas were identical with Thomas: but John always calls the latter simply Thomas. It is true that it is in the East an ancient custom to call Thomas Judas (comp. Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* i. 13, 11, Cureton on the M'pharsho, pp. L. sq., and in his *Ancient Syriac Documents*, pp. 33 sq.); and in reality Thomas was originally in signification only a surname; see *ante*, p. 303. However, the words John xiv. 22 cannot be explained with any reference to that custom.

[1] A. *κοινήν* according to customary Greek usage; but how different from this of Christ were the subsequent *cœnobia*!

[2] As Mark xiv. 13, Luke ix. 52.

[3] According to John xii. 6, xiii. 29. In the first passage *ἐβάσταζεν* is undoubtedly meant to designate him as the customary bearer and guardian of the purse, particularly as it cannot be supposed that by this office he had very much to carry.

[4] According to Mark x. 35, xv. 40, 41, xvi. 9, the specially important statement Luke viii. 2, 3, and some other indications. To enumerate them here as far as we can recognise them, they were (1) Mary of Magdala (see *ante*, p. 223), who is most frequently mentioned, and was undoubtedly the most zealous of them all; (2) Salome, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, see p. 181; (3) Johanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's governor, Luke viii. 3, probably therefore the widow of a governor who had been appointed by Antipas over the smaller districts of his territory, and undoubtedly the same woman that is called Johanna simply Luke xxiv. 10; (4) Susanna, Luke viii. 3, otherwise unknown; (5) Mary the mother of James the *Less*, meaning the *younger* according to the Hebrew idiom, of whom we have already spoken, p. 304; (6) the mother of Jose: according to Mark xv. 40, comp. with ver. 47 (the best reading), Matt. xxvii. 56, she was without doubt quite another person than the Mary just mentioned, though it is true she might be the same as Johanna or Susanna; (7) Mary the mother of Clopas, John xix. 25, accordingly certainly the mother of that disciple of the wider circle who is called Cleopas Luke xxiv. 18, and whose name is shortened from Cleopater, but often in recent times wholly without reason and erroneously confounded with the genuine Hebrew name Alphæus. So many women of this kind are known to us by name; quite different from these, therefore, were Mary and Martha the sisters of Lazarus, as to whom see below; and nothing is more baseless and perverse than to confound this Mary with Mary Magdalena, as unfortunately often happened subsequently.

Amongst them were some who were evidently in good circumstances, who gladly offered their entire worldly wealth for the higher cause of Christ. But neither the brothers of Jesus nor his mother stood as yet in any even distant connection with the Community, although they did not remain wholly indifferent as to his doings and fortunes.[1] The Twelve themselves, however, had already forsaken all worldly things for the sake of the one object which Jesus had explained to them as that of the kingdom of God itself. Of that they could boast;[2] and that Community, which came before the world in the first Apostolic age, keeping its celestial purpose alone in view and subordinating to it all earthly possessions, was already on the earth in fact as regards its outline and first formation.

III. Until the Last Journey to Jerusalem.

Yet these were only the external outlines of this Community, as it gradually took more definite shape. In it Christ was now about to lay a second more subtle and at the same time firmer foundation for the work of his life upon the broader and more general foundation which he had previously made. The labour for this purpose, though in point of area perhaps more limited, must become as regards the material itself all the more delicate and careful. His object was to produce a body in which his own spirit could continue its work on earth even if he himself should be taken from it. And this period of the most intense prosecution of his labour lasted, as we shall see below, only some year and a half. It is true the tooth of the world could gnaw even this first tender germ of a true Community of the perfected true religion as soon as it began to take somewhat firmer form. Everything that enters the world as a visible institution and external body, however necessary it may be, and at first kindled and formed by the purest spirit from on high, must immediately submit to the limitations of space, number, and other conditions of all kinds. Twelve—not more and not fewer—were to constitute this inner circle. Are they all, as they are chosen, already safe, in view of

[1] Anything more definite than this cannot with certainty be said, particularly as regards his mother, at all events so far as the period before us is concerned, if we duly weigh such clear accounts as Mark iii. 21 sq. with the analogous ones, as well as other points to be considered below. It is when he is on the cross that we first see her by his side, according to John xix. 25, 26. Nothing is more baseless, according to the New Testament documents, than Mariolatry.

[2] According to Mark x. 28, Matt. xix. 27, Luke xviii. 28, from which we see plainly how much importance was then all along attached to that fact.

all the future developments and trials of the Community? And money, subordinate matter as it is in this case, cannot be wholly avoided: are they all constantly secure against its fresh attractions and many other new allurements? But we must now turn our attention to what is incomparably more important, and see particularly how Jesus himself actually laid this far more delicate higher foundation of his life-work, which was much more difficult to lay than the first.

It hardly requires to be expressly said lastly in this connection, that though Jesus had now to direct his chief attention to the training of the Twelve, he did not on that account cease to labour also for the people generally, or omit anything that he could do in the way of teaching and healing amongst a wider circle. Towards the masses of the people he remained what he had always been; only he was compelled now to redouble his own labours that he might pursue the same object, that had from the beginning been before him, by two different kinds of daily work at once. Indeed, even in order to properly teach the Twelve how they had to labour amongst the people, and thereby to train them to become fully his true disciples and continuators of his work, he could not during any part of this period relax his labours for the masses of the people, but must, where it was possible and appropriate, prosecute them before the eyes of the Twelve themselves; and he could not slacken his efforts still further to extend, and ever afresh strengthen, the first foundation, upon which he was now seeking to lay a second. Thus the one of the two objects to which he now devoted his life was interwoven with the other, and whatever was done for the one was not unproductive for the other. But not to attract the attention of the world, naturally seemed to him more necessary now than even in the previous period.

1. *His higher instruction regarding the kingdom of God and his earthly Community.*

If we now take a general view of everything that Christ did for his present main object in the course of this period of some year and a half, as far as the most reliable accounts now in our possession enable us to do this, we must be astonished not only at what he accomplished, but also at the method and the successive steps by which he accomplished it. It is quite true that we are now hardly in a position to distinguish particularly the numerous discourses, the attendant unslacking abundance

of deeds, and the other events in his career, so as to be able to describe them all in the precise order of their occurrence; although we shall see that we are really not left altogether without indications as to the general chronological course of this period of the highest efforts of Christ's whole life. And the nature of the case itself shows that the conduct of Jesus towards the Twelve, as well as what he otherwise did or experienced during this period, was unfolded in its great general outlines as Mark first sought to describe it connectedly.

As soon as Jesus saw himself surrounded by the Twelve, it must have been his first business to impart to them that more definite and higher instruction concerning both the inward and the outward aspect of the kingdom of God, which was alone able to accustom them gradually to the proper mode of labouring for that kingdom. There must have been a time when this higher instruction to such an intimate circle became his most important daily work; and when he, though in the midst of his other labours, still by preference and necessity seized every opportunity for prosecuting this; and that time was this occasion of his closer intimacy with the Twelve, before he could venture to permit them to take a more independent part in his own life-work.

The first and most necessary thing was, therefore, once more to give fuller instruction regarding the nature and the duties of the Community of the perfect religion; it was his fixed purpose to found this Community as soon as he chose the Twelve, and it was already visibly and plainly actually present the moment they followed him as their lord and king who would lead them to God. It was in this Community that the most abundant seed for the kingdom of God itself could first grow up and promise fruit. The two chief subjects of this instruction must therefore be—the nature and the requirements of the perfected true religion itself, and particularly in its relation to the religion which was then taught in Israel and based upon single portions of the sacred Scriptures, and then the nature of the proper means of grace or virtue, in order to be able to maintain the elevation of life demanded by that religion; and the instruction on these two chief matters must be suited for such disciples as had already passed beyond the lower stage of knowledge, and had already resolved to labour in a more special way with the Messiah at the great work of the kingdom of God itself. If Jesus, therefore, as we have seen,[1] took the Twelve when he had chosen them with him up

[1] *Ante*, p. 297.

to the 'mountain' to which he was till then accustomed to retire alone rather, it is nothing but probable that he then devoted himself at once also to their instruction in such fundamental truths of the new Community, and lingered for some time in this occupation. In so far, therefore, the 'Sermon on the Mount,' which appears in the Gospel literature as of such special importance, has a sound historical meaning; and undoubtedly, although revived and afresh arranged after a more artistic manner, contains a multitude of such truths as were then first heard, and could never subsequently be forgotten by mankind. This 'sermon' really presents only those two chief matters, but it is introduced in the form of a genuine speech of salutation, and closes with a brief significant glance into the future as regards its temptations and safeguards. According to all indications Mark himself gave the discourse in this place, although abbreviated after his manner, only that just at this point of his Gospel that considerable omission was made by his last editor which we cannot now restore.[1] And if originally it stood quite at the beginning of Matthew's Collected Sayings, we can the more readily understand how the last author of the present first Gospel could place it so early that it appears to be the first lengthy discourse which Christ ever spoke: a supposition, however, which was possibly only because it became by degrees customary to regard this entire period, in which certainly Christ's activity with the choice of the Twelve reached its climax, almost as the sole period of his active public life. As the memory of the first of the three periods of his whole public labours, which, as we have seen,[2] was first once more plainly distinguished from the others by John, is almost wholly obscured in the Gospel of Mark, so likewise the second of them began to be obscured and confounded with the third as the great chief period. This is shown very plainly by the present first Gospel, while Luke, again, keeps much freer from this confusion.[3] On that account this discourse also, which at all events, from some of its chief utterances, can have been intended only for the more intimate circle of disciples, or (to speak more definitely) only for those who were already regarded as members of the new Community, appears in the present Gospel of Matthew,[4] and likewise in Luke, as having been de-

[1] See further on this point and on the discourse generally *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 257 sq.—As regards the correct meaning and derivation of ἐπιούσιος in the Lord's Prayer, see also *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1867, pp. 1349–55.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 242 sq.

[3] That is, notwithstanding the evident brevity with which he describes these earlier times as he follows his various sources.

[4] According to Matt. vii. 28, 29; yet at the beginning, v. 2, 3, at all events the disciples only are named as the

livered in the hearing of the masses of the people; so that at last it was only a consistent inference when Luke describes it as delivered by Jesus only after he had come down from the mountain to a 'level field' (where many hundreds could easily hear).[1]

If the Community of the perfected true religion once exists, the kingdom of God also is promoted perpetually in it much more powerfully than if its king (Messiah) at first walks as yet quite alone upon the earth without a definite circle of sympathisers and associates around him. If with the very first step of his public work, as we have seen,[2] Jesus had to proclaim the approach, and indeed the actual beginning, of the kingdom of God, and to invite all to take part in it, he was obliged now, since already a more definite way to that participation had been opened and more particular experience regarding it had been gained, to speak about it and explain its nature with a wholly new zeal. And he was obliged to speak about it constantly to the people generally also, inasmuch as he had to speak to the masses about it from the very beginning, and ultimately it formed the one greatest subject upon which he had always to speak. Accordingly now, when a firmer commencement for the promotion of the kingdom of God in the earth had been made by the actual establishment of the Community of perfected religion, he could speak of that kingdom with greater clearness, joy, and hope than ever before. But the kingdom of God, as we have seen,[3] was regarded by him, even from the stage of a proper and more established beginning of it, only as a constantly growing thing which would but gradually reach its completion, as a kingdom which would never occupy the whole present, inasmuch as it was above all things spiritual and celestial. Accordingly, at this point prophetic anticipation, with its figurative modes of speech, naturally presented itself to him as the only form in which things that the intuition of the soul alone can seize can be presented more fully in thought and language, and which that intuition must nevertheless grasp as surely as if they were already palpably present. But where this region of prophetic intuition predominates, the mind that both profoundly penetrates

immediate auditors of the discourse. The fact that the time of the choice of the Twelve is uncertain in our present Matt., and that we might even suppose it is referred to v. 1, 2 is connected with this chronological confusion: for x. 1–5, the names of the Twelve are simply supplied to fill up an earlier omission.

[1] Luke vi. 17; still, according to Luke ver. 20, the discourse is at all events delivered with special reference to the disciples.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 201 sq.

[3] Pp. 201 sq.

its depths and handles it with perfect lucidity and abundant illustration, casts its various intuitions into the form of appropriate symbols and pictures from life.[1] And thus Jesus loved to embody and illustrate before the people, in no less appropriate than charming parables, his intuitions particularly as to the beginning of the kingdom of God,[2] which was so toilsome and disappointing to many hopes, though it could not be received with murmuring, and as to its really joyous progress and its inestimable worth. We cannot say that Jesus composed such parables simply for the sake of the common people; on the contrary, not a few of the truest and most perfect intuitions cannot at all be otherwise expressed so briefly and appropriately; but he loved to speak to the masses of the people upon such matters with abundant copiousness and charming grace, that it might be seen whether some amongst them would not be stimulated to meditate further upon the inner meaning of the parables. But it follows as a matter of course that this inner meaning was unveiled to the disciples, whether they asked for it or not. In their case the important thing was that they should comprehend the truths themselves upon the foundation of which alone all such intuitions and symbols rest, if they are sound and appropriate; and he desired that no one of them should remain without an independent personal insight into these pure truths. The beauty and perfection of many simple parables which Christ had abundantly thrown off undoubtedly proved later also variously attractive as they were recalled by the disciples, and incited them to repeated attempts to exhaust more in detail the subject-matter of each and explain it in the sense of Christ himself: we can see this still in the parables preserved in the Gospels. For though it is true that the Collected Sayings of Matthew had already adopted as a parallel piece to the Sermon on the Mount a larger series of seven such parables, which Jesus once delivered by the Lake of Galilee as he spoke to the people from a boat, yet on the other hand, although both Mark, and still more the last author of the Gospel of Matthew, drew most directly

[1] Matt. xiii. 1–52, with the parallel passages in Mark and Luke.

[2] Its beginning, as regards its effective cause, can be traced back ultimately to the Word, that is, Christ himself; and inasmuch as he can compare his work, as far as it is this beginning, with that of the husbandman sowing good seed, and also, according to p. 275, with that of the labourer casting out a net, it is necessarily implied that the kingdom of God, even when the proper labour for it is already supplied, does not nevertheless come at once and necessarily to all men; its beginning, therefore, cannot in so far fulfil every hope. The seven parables which are explained in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 286–293 may, therefore, according to the above reference to their subject-matter, be divided most correctly into 3, 2, 2.

from this source, the parables and their interpretations are found in both of them really considerably dissimilar.

However, there must have passed a somewhat considerable interval between such abounding instructions regarding the kingdom of God about to rise in this Community and the first founding of the latter. Those instructions presuppose the beginning and the growth of the kingdom in a particular field, partly of narrower and partly of wider extent, and proceed from abundant experience of the most various kinds regarding the nature of this higher phenomenon which was always casting its rays into the visible world only from a distance. Moreover, Christ was constantly under the necessity of returning as soon as possible to the larger sphere of his general labours, and of further prosecuting his work there as much as possible. It is therefore quite in conformity with the development of the whole history that Mark[1] inserts a piece of a more narrative character between those two great portions of the higher instruction regarding the inner nature and the fundamental condition (that is, the perfect religion as it must rule in the true Community) of the kingdom of God, and regarding the history of the kingdom which is now beginning, inserting it at the point where we see Christ, having come down from the mountain, pursuing his labours again in Capernaum after his former manner. And as Mark always likes in such cases to present, by the grouping together of narratives of a related meaning, a complete piece of the great historical phenomenon, so in this case he seeks to represent by the narratives which he groups together

the relation of the Lord of the Community now being formed to demons and to men.

Christ is now already as two men as regards his influence, power, and reputation in the world, and not less so as regards his wearisome and trying labours in it, with its suspicions and all its presuppositions, whether they were generous but unfitting or ill-natured; and now precisely at the beginning of this his new attitude, his labours must be the most intense and energetic. If his spirit is now as it were doubly active, doubly on the strain, and doubly powerful, the evil spirits flee all the more helplessly before him, but, on the other hand, the more enigmatical and mysterious may his own spirit easily appear to

[1] Mark iii. 19*b*–35 comp. with the parallel passages in Matt. and Luke.

men of the most various classes and most different positions with regard to him.

The first half of this twofold truth which the history of Christ generally had taught, and which must have been most forcibly exemplified precisely during this period of his labours, is taught by the narrative which relates how the evil spirits which tormented the son of a heathen centurion at Capernaum flee before the Christ as he descends from the Mount of the inauguration of the new Community.[1] We have, however, already seen[2] that this special history belongs, according to John's more exact memory, really to a much earlier time, when, however, Christ similarly returned to Capernaum after a considerable absence, and as it were driven by the spirit of a higher experience. But if it was in narrating once removed to this later place, to a time when the Community has already been founded, then, quite in accordance with the meaning of Christ, those words in which he expressed his joy at such faith precisely on the part of a heathen, and the prophecy that the heathen would in multitudes enter the kingdom of God rather than the Judeans, were very appropriately connected particularly with it.[3] When once the Community of the perfect religion is called into existence, although it rises in the midst of Israel, and is from the first capable of being formed in it only, it already both confronts the whole world and also stands freely open to it, so that in the presence of this Community all earlier differences of the various religions vanish: a truth which can be uttered immediately upon the inauguration of the Community, and was certainly uttered sufficiently early by Christ.

With all the more certainty does the narrative[4] illustrating the second portion of this twofold truth belong to this period. When Jesus is again at home with his Twelve, there arises immediately such a crowding of people seeking help in various forms about him and the Twelve, that they cannot find time or place so much as to refresh themselves with food. It is the less surprising that he himself, in the midst of the enormous strain and exhaustion of those days, appeared to many, who without

[1] This narrative, which was interpreted *ante*, pp. 267 sq. after three Gospels, was undoubtedly originally found in Mark also, as has been briefly proved in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 279 sq., and could be easily further established.

[2] P. 270.

[3] Matt. viii. 10–12; the form of the principal words, vv. 11, 12, is quite as if they came from the Collected Sayings (comp. also xvii. 24, 25); and the thoughts themselves have great similarity with those of the parables of the kingdom of God which are placed nearer the end of the public labours of Jesus in Galilee. But it cannot be maintained that Jesus did not utter a thought like this very early.

[4] Mark iii. 19*b*–35.

properly knowing him observed only his outward appearance and the tremendous conflict of his soul therein depicted, to be growing mad, as from madness approaching a swoon, and already acting and suffering but convulsively.[1] And already this appearance in such an unusual situation had produced an effect in the most various ways upon even remote circles. Already the report had spread in the town that he had become mad from exhaustion. When his relatives (namely, his brothers and his mother only as we have seen),[2] hear this report, they hasten to seek him and take charge of him, but find the house closely surrounded by crowds of people, and cannot for a long time get near him; they were still far from appreciating his present elevated position, but feel nevertheless in this unexpected moment of trouble natural human pity for him, and think that they are called upon to assist him in some way. But while they are gradually coming to look after him, in the room itself, or at all events quite near to him, and sufficiently audible, a very different kind of commotion has broken out. Some Scribes who have arrived from Jerusalem with evil designs, have at once laid hold in their own sense of the notion which has got abroad of his mental condition, and have discovered in this condition a proof of the suspicion they have long cherished, that he is possessed by the chief demon of bad diseases (*Beelzebul*), the same demon by whom he also works his miracles, by whom particularly he expels the demons. But if such a serious charge, particularly when made by such wise authorities of the capital city, can bring others when in such a state of mind absolutely to despair, it simply gives him the occasion to expose the absurdity of the accusation, and at the same time to discuss everything connected with the point raised in such a way that the charge returns upon the heads of those who think and speak such malicious things: and that the more the more perversely they sought in the course of the contention they had raised to tempt him further by demanding that a miracle should be performed by him before their eyes. The discourses which the Collected Sayings had already, only in connection with another occasion,[3] placed together at this point as in refutation of such thoughtless charges and demands with regard to Christ, are equal in their marvellous elevation to all the rest of that collection, and conduct to a summit where we feel that we are no

[1] Just as even the greatest prophets of the Old Testament were supposed to fall into similar states; see *Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 15 sq.

[2] *Ante*, p. 179

[3] The healing of a dumb man, Matt. xii. 22–45, Luke xi. 14, 15.

longer far removed from the commanding height of the discourses of the Gospel of John. Meanwhile all had seated themselves around him listening to his wonderful words. It is then that the announcement first reaches him, that his mother and brothers stand without seeking him. But if as Messiah he labours always at a work before the divinity of which all the lower circumstances, considerations, and cares of his previous life vanish from his view, how much more must he at this moment, when engaged in such a lofty manner and attended by such blessings on his labours as head of the Community, regard those as mother and sister and brother who surround him as they do who are here attracted by his word! and deriving only fresh strength from his highest labour instead of fainting and weakness, how little does he in fact need the help, well meant as it may be, of those who do not as yet understand him, and do not as yet labour with him in those things which never bring exhaustion!

Similarly, at another time, when a woman, carried away by the matchless truth and power of his discourse, pronounced the mother blessed that bore him, he turned her words into a benediction upon those who hear and keep the word of God.[1] And if in this time of great strain and effort he already met with such elevating experiences as head in his Community, in spite of all misunderstandings and hostilities, we can the more readily understand how, when he retreated again from the commotion of the town to the freedom of the lake side, he could then speak, as we have seen above,[2] to those who sought him there in such calm, bright, illustrative similes of the beginning and of the growth and worth of the kingdom of God. They were already the first fruits of his most exalted labours which he now tasted, and which his mind put into the form of refreshing instruction, in the midst of the toils of the sultry noon of his life.

2. *The practical training of the Twelve:* (a) *by journeys with them.*

But he was soon about to provide for himself much sweeter fruits still of this kind. After the Twelve had received sufficient higher instruction for the beginning, it was time to practise them in the details of the work of their life. Their great life-work, as it was allotted to them as the first members of this Community, was necessarily the proclamation of the Gospel

[1] Luke xi. 27, 28. [2] Pp. 310 sq.

throughout the world. Accordingly, he determined now in the first instance to take them as his attendants upon a journey which he himself was about to begin in the prosecution of the same work. His purpose was that they should, further from home, gather more experiences than they could do in one town, that they should share with him the perils of such a journey into unknown regions, that they should hear how he proclaimed everywhere the same Gospel, and yet everywhere differently and with freshness, and they should behold how he everywhere also actively rendered assistance and performed cures where help was really possible and called for by a higher compassion.

It follows almost from the nature of the case that such a journey of practical training was undertaken by him in preparation of the Twelve for independent itinerancies; we do not now know quite exactly at what time of the year it was made, but, according to the indications to be explained below, it was probably undertaken in the late autumn of this same year. There was no object to be gained by any very great extension of it; yet it had necessarily to present some variety to be sufficiently instructive, and may very well have occupied a full month or somewhat longer. We can still form from Mark[1] a somewhat detailed idea of it, since at this point also he presents, in a series of separate pictures, the most prominent and most lastingly remembered phenomena occurring in it.

1. The very commencement of this journey could furnish them with a new lesson. According to Mark, Jesus started in the evening of the same day on which he had, by the western shore of the Lake of Galilee, given to the people those calm bright parables of the kingdom of God,[2] on a journey to the eastern shore. He had on that day, as we have seen he was at other times accustomed to do,[3] spoken from the raised beak of a boat to the people crowding upon the shore; he now commanded the Twelve who were with him in the boat to row with him to the other side; he had not provided himself further with food or other supplies for the journey, yet he was determined to enter upon it, and the Twelve were ready, after the assembled multitude had been dismissed, at once to put out with him into the lake; other boats also accompanied them on the passage.

Then there arose a great whirlwind, and the waves beat over the boat so that it already almost sunk under them. But he himself was sleeping meanwhile in the stern upon the

[1] Mark iv. 35—vi. 6, with the parallel passages in Matt. and Luke.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 310 sq.

[3] *Ante*, p. 276.

cushion[1] which had been placed there, as if even the most violent commotion in the world could not wake him. We are here involuntarily reminded of the similar situation of that ancient prophet described in the Book of Jonah; but what a wholly different issue appears in this case! When at last his disciples, not without a gentle reproach on account of his apparent want of sympathy, venture to wake him, he commands the wind and the sea to be calm, and when, unexpectedly and to the astonishment of all, suddenly a great calm arises, he reproves the Twelve for their needless fears and want of faith. Thus at the very beginning of the journey it appears how greatly higher trust in God and calm self-possession amid external commotion are wanting in their case. But their confidence in his Messianic greatness had not a little increased.

2. On the south-eastern shore they came into the district inhabited chiefly by heathen, which was called Decapolis, because it belonged to the ten free cities in north-eastern Palestine.[2] A region which was less inhabited by Judeans was always more difficult to travel through; it is therefore significant that Jesus did not avoid even such a district for his present purpose, but rather intentionally selected it. And here he now met, not far from the lake, in the hilly district of a town Gergesa,[3] a demoniac than whom none could be more terrible. The man believed himself to be tormented by innumerable evil spirits, and called them himself accordingly by the Roman name *Legion*, which was then new in Palestine; he was infuriated and raged against all men, and possessed in his madness such an untamed and savage strength that he had constantly rent asunder all kinds of chains with which people sought to bind him. Avoided by all men accordingly, he had habituated himself to his solitary dwelling amongst the tombs[4] on the hill outside the town, and lived there like an animal, naked, yelling, gashing himself with stones as if to get free from his pains. But Jesus had sufficient power of love and healing to deliver even a creature thus scarcely human, if he

[1] The προσκεφάλαιον Mark iv. 38. James Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (London, 1848), pp. 243, 296–300. considers it the same as the cushion of the bank of oars; and undoubtedly such a boat was probably not supplied with special conveniences for comfort.

[2] See vol. v. p. 455.

[3] Comp. vol. i. p. 232. The reading *Gerasa* had probably itself originated only from Gergasa, or the word could have arisen from the same sounds as a dialectical divergence; for it is impossible that the *Gerasa* which still remains in magnificent ruins, can originally have been meant here, as it is situated much too far from the Lake of Galilee. *Gadara* also, which is found as another ancient reading, as separated by the Yarmuk, lay too far from the Lake to be intended here.

[4] As in India Buddhistic saints at the present time like to dwell near tombs. Spence Hardy's *Eastern Monachism*, pp. 135 sq.

should approach him. And really, as all demoniacs feel a secret desire to be saved, so this man was seen hastening from a distance to Jesus; but when he heard Jesus commanding the unclean spirit to come out of him, dread of the tremendous pains of this expulsion fell upon him, and having approached quite close he begs at the feet of his deliverer that he will not torment him. But Jesus will not let him go; on the contrary, by questions penetrates more and more deeply the soul of the man, as if he would entice and urge more and more irresistibly the thousand spirits within him to declare and entrust themselves to the higher pure spirit. And already they feel, and the possessed man himself feels with them, that his mighty word can no longer be resisted; but they fear on both sides that they must be driven forthwith into the underworld to die,[1] and request that they may at least be treated in the mildest manner; so they desire also that they may not be sent away into the distant desolate wilderness;[2] and as if the wretched man, who was undoubtedly, originally at least, of the Judean faith, ventured at last once more to recollect, under the steady, stern, but benevolent glance of Christ, the greatness of his Judean origin, and thereby to return once more generally to reason, he requests that they may be allowed to enter into a herd of swine which were feeding close at hand, as if really such only were the proper place for them. But (as the story soon ran in a more developed form) as soon as Jesus gives them permission to do this, so tremendous is their career, through fear of him, as they pass out of the man into the swine, that they immediately throw the swine themselves into the wildest flight, and the latter rush irresistibly down the declivity into the sea, and thus perishing carry with them these unclean spirits themselves, although sorely against their will, into the underworld; whilst the man who had been delivered from them comes at once to the repose he had long desired.

This narrative, one of the most elaborate and most instructive in its way that Mark gives, enables us to glance most deeply into

[1] 'Demons do not willingly die, because they will never be delivered from hell to live again,' was the special meaning of this belief (whence we simply see that people in so far estimated them according to their own bad conscience), Tatian, *ad Græc.* xxiii.–xxxi. (14–18). It was supposed, therefore, that they gladly left the man possessed by them before his death, that they might not go with him into hell.

[2] The desert (not so bad as the underworld) is, according to ancient ideas, their usual abode, from which they seek to enter into men; see with regard to the desert the earlier ideas of a similar nature belonging to the sixth century B.C., and moreover, primarily, to the Babylonian regions, where they were thus developed in their most original form ('Isa.' xiii. 21, 22, xxxiv. 14, 15; Jer. l. 39. As regards this extremely difficult narrative of the demoniac of Gergesa generally, see further my essay in the *Jahrbb. der Bibl. Wiss.* vii. pp. 54–67.

the ideas regarding evil spirits and demoniacs which prevailed at that time, and even on that very account belongs without doubt to those which were once most frequently repeated. That the district was heathen is proved also by the mention of the herd of swine; but the idea which expressed itself in the wish of the evil spirits to enter such a herd could only be ascribed to a demoniac who was originally not a heathen. It is evidently enough, further, an authentic recollection that the herd perished; the demoniac might easily by his last horrible convulsions and violent movements come into closer contact with one of these animals, and one head of the herd in its fright might easily affect all the rest, and cause them to rush off with it; so that on the spot a real connection between this circumstance and the convulsions, and accordingly the cure of the man that immediately followed, might at once have been inferred. But it was nothing but popular Judean satire that could, in the midst of the multitude of conflicting ideas regarding the unclean spirits and their base liking for the unclean swine, make this connection so close and weave it thus into this narrative. Indeed, it is further only the same Judean national satire which, when the report of the affair had spread abroad, found a kind of pleasure in the destruction of the herd of swine, and, as it were, feasted itself in thinking that these unclean creatures had been destroyed as from above at a place which ought to have been sacred national soil. Nowhere else can we so clearly trace as here the manner and rapidity with which the narratives about Christ's deeds were spread amongst wide circles of people, and were listened to and retold with great delight even amongst Judeans; and many who otherwise had no desire to hear much of the deeds of Jesus, might nevertheless enjoy this story of the swine, as they had during the centuries immediately preceding become of such curious importance as regards the relation between Israel and the heathen. Meanwhile (as the narrative closed quite suitably in this tone), the owners of the herd and the other inhabitants of the town, although displeased (as may well be supposed) at the loss of their swine, did not call Jesus to account as if he had directly caused it; but astonished at all that had happened, and not least at the demoniac who was now healed and in his right mind, and whom they had been so little able to render harmless, they required Jesus simply to leave their district. When he entered the boat, the healed sufferer begged even that he might be allowed to accompany him as one who had been converted; but he commanded him rather to proclaim in his own native country, and therefore amongst the heathen also,

the praise of the true Saviour and God, as one of the most impressive living witnesses of divine salvation. Christ was great therefore in this also, that he did not in any way seek the honour of counting amongst his attendants one who had been saved from a heathen country and the most grievous superstition; whilst nevertheless he did not the less sympathise with the lot of the 'children of Abraham' scattered amongst the heathen, and, indeed, with the lot of the heathen themselves, and came to the assistance of the individual heathen when it was beneficial, as well as his own fellow-countrymen.

Of other events on this journey by the eastern shore of the Lake we now know nothing. When he returned across the Lake into the neighbourhood of Capernaum, a multitude of people again at once gathered about him, so that he remained for a considerable time by the shore. Then came from the town one of the elders of the Synagogue, Jairus by name, with the no less humble than urgent request, that Jesus from pity for his dying[1] daughter, of twelve years of age, would hasten to his house to save her. Whilst he was then departing thither, attended by the thronging multitude, a woman pushed her way to him who had suffered greatly twelve years from an issue of blood,[2] had on that account spent her whole means under the treatment of many physicians, and had yet nevertheless only grown worse. She had probably come from a distance, knew no one there who could introduce her to Jesus, of whose power of healing she had heard, but had so much faith in him that scarcely had she tremblingly touched the tassel[3] hanging from his garment behind, when she already felt herself relieved and healed. But after all it has again by no means been his mere garment which wrought the cure; and if the woman supposed this, he feels and knows that it is otherwise, and may not suffer a new superstition of this kind to arise. So he turns round that he may see the person, and asks who touched his garments. The disciples do not as yet comprehend what he seeks and why he puts such a question, since in the case of such a throng it is not surprising that his garments should be touched; however, he feels better what must have been done, and looks round repeatedly with a stern glance; and not until the woman, feeling that she has been discovered and hastening forward with alarm, has confessed to him all the truth both regarding her deed and her faith, does he confirm the cure with

[1] Matt. and Luke have instead *dead*, but less correctly.

[2] See *Antiquities*, p. 157.

[3] See *Antiquities*, p. 231.

comforting words.[1] During this unexpected delay, there arrived the message from the house of the Ruler of the Synagogue, that his daughter was already dead, and he need not trouble Jesus further; but, as if he had not heard this, Jesus exhorts the father only to be of strong faith, hastens with his three most intimate disciples forward, enters with hopeful words the house, which was already filled on the one hand with the flute-players playing the customary death-dirge, and on the other with mourning relatives, at once betakes himself, although laughed at, with the parents and his three disciples alone, into the upper-chamber of the house where the child lay alone in death, and reanimates it by the grasp of his hand and a mighty call. He then ordered the restored child to have food given to her, but, as was always his custom in those times, as we have seen,[2] desired that much should not be said of the help he had rendered.

3. It is altogether credible, as the early account states, that Jesus now without any further stay in Capernaum took the Twelve with him further on a journey into the south-west. But in this quarter they were destined to make exactly the opposite experience; in Nazareth, which we may call his native village, which he touched on this journey, he appeared in the Synagogue on a Sabbath to teach, but had soon to find that the people there were the less disposed to believe on him the greater the power of his word and the fame of the miracles which had preceded him. Influenced by petty considerations and ignoble jealousy, they were inclined to look more at the human aspects best known to them—his origin, his earlier history amongst them, and his kindred who were still dwelling there,—than at those which were eternal and divine. Moreover, the malicious report of his exclusion from the Synagogue, above referred to,[3] may already have been brought to Nazareth from Jerusalem, and industriously spread abroad by his enemies. This reception did not, it is true, according to the course of the world, come to him unexpectedly, inasmuch as he knew that such jealousy on the part of his own native place and kindred had always been very prevalent in the world; still he was justly astonished at their unbelief most of all, as that certainly had never been so completely baseless anywhere in the world as in this case. Neither

[1] The Latin name *Veronica*, corrupted from Berenice, by which this woman was subsequently called, is probably derived from the Greek inscription of the statues above referred to, p. 157; and how greatly the history of these two statues was subsequently expanded is shown in Malala's *Chronographia*, pp. 237–39 of the Bonn edition.

[2] P. 307.

[3] P. 293.

was he able, as this early narrative still does not hesitate in its great faithfulness to record according to authentic recollection, to perform amongst them any miracle worth naming, precisely because of their predominant unbelief; only a few sick people were healed by him by laying on of hands and the other well-known means.

Undoubtedly this rejection of the gospel precisely in Nazareth, the native place of Jesus, always formed a very prominent reminiscence in the earlier Gospel traditions; and many other things in addition to those just referred to were related with regard to it. The little place received thereby a specially unfavourable reputation for Galilee: and justly so, inasmuch as Jesus did not appear publicly in it until, precisely in his native place, a much higher degree of consideration ought to have met him, as one who had long approved himself, and was, indeed, already surrounded by a number of disciples, worthy of all honour. For from all the circumstances and the way of speaking in the older narrative, it admits of no doubt that this was the first time that he entered Nazareth as the Messiah: he had undoubtedly, as he knew it well, good reasons for not putting it earlier to such a test. Petty village jealousy of other places in Galilee, particularly of Capernaum, appears also to have had its influence: this was at all events probably the chief consideration which had guided the Collected Sayings in alluding to the occurrence and placing together some discourses referring to it. He required of the Nazarenes repentance and faith: they, on the other hand, required that he should first show them just such miracles as they heard he had performed in Capernaum; had they defects, he also had one in their estimation, and accordingly in this case the ancient proverb applied, 'Physician, heal thyself!' In reply, it is said, that he then showed to them the truth, that lofty works and divine help are not to be claimed and demanded, and that the great prophets of old in their day had not received the commission to help in physical want all the numerous people who may have expected divine succour, but only certain individuals; moreover, he knew, and everyone acquainted with the ancient history might also easily know, that the true prophet nowhere receives a poorer reception than in his own native place.[1] Such truths were in fact here in place, and enough was said by them

[1] We accordingly suppose that the words Luke iv. 23–27 were taken by Luke from the Collected Sayings, but received at the same time (as is obvious) a freer turn, particularly at the beginning, in being connected with what had gone before.

in this particular case; especially may the saying about the prophet in his native place be traced back, according to definite early recollection, to Christ himself, as indeed follows from the considerations previously referred to.[1] A later narrator, however, considered it proper that Jesus should from the beginning of his public labours make his first appearance precisely in Nazareth, the scene of his youth. According to this narrator, when he entered, as was his wont, on the Sabbath the Synagogue, he caused the sacred Scriptures to be handed to him, that he might read and teach from them; he first read from the prophetic book of Isaiah exactly those passages which concern most immediately the first appearance of the Messiah, and, indeed, might as it were call him forth and likewise be his attestation; and then amid the deepest attention of his hearers delivered a discourse, which at first excited the greatest admiration at such gracious words, but soon, as he at last in stern tones demanded from them true repentance and amendment, particularly that they should not regard his previous merely human relations to them as their fellow-townsman, provoked them to such displeasure, and, indeed, wild indignation against him, that they cast him out of the town and drove him to the edge of a mountain in order to cast him down from it; nevertheless he escaped, advancing through their midst with a firm step. And undoubtedly the tradition records, as we have seen,[2] not without foundation, that at the commencement of his public appearance even such experiences of utmost contempt and mortal peril were not spared him; and it has also the appearance of authentic history, that on one occasion he made such prophetic passages the basis of his proclamation. But it is contrary to the earlier reports and reminiscences, that all this happened in Nazareth, and at such an early period, indeed that his entire public work was commenced there; and it is Luke who first connects this later tradition with the earlier ones in the best way he could.[3]

But he did not allow himself to be kept by the contempt

[1] P. 182.

[2] *Ante*, p. 253.

[3] After repeated examination it seems to me evident that Luke inserted here those sentences from the Collected Sayings instead of others, which, according to the subsequent narrative, must have their place here, in order thus to explain the origin of their terrible anger, vv. 28, 29. It is true the words, ver. 22, 'Is not this Joseph's son?' make a transition from the first simple admiration: but they are much too feeble and unfinished to explain sufficiently the following words as they are now put together. According to all indications, therefore, we can only trace the present connection and final editing of all the parts of this narrative concerning Nazareth (the only one that Luke supplies, and in which he probably thus presses everything into one narrative because he did not intend to supply a second) to Luke's own hand.

which he with his disciples had experienced in Nazareth from the prosecution in the neighbourhood generally of his great life-work, in which the Twelve accompanied him. The narrative of the succour which in deepest pity he brought to the widow mother of an only son, whom she was just following to the grave, may also belong to this time: this took place in the little town of Nain, south-east of Nazareth, situated on one of the southern slopes of Tabor. But it is now narrated by Luke [1] only, and by him from a somewhat late source, where undoubtedly it was likewise reported but very briefly: a detailed view of all the circumstances of the event, such as we find Mark ever so instructively making, is wanting in this case; and we can only say that the burial which is spoken of followed, already according to the custom of those times,[2] very soon after death.

(b) *By sending them on Missions alone.*

When the Twelve had been already more specially prepared for their ultimate vocation by experiences of this kind gained in their journeys with Jesus, as well as by the detailed instructions which they had previously received, he could venture now to send them forth on trial by themselves, that they might learn to promote the kingdom of God by their own labours. With that the time had now arrived for which he himself must have so much longed. For it must have been one of his highest endeavours to habituate them as early as possible to independent work for the kingdom of God: and no one could desire more than himself their increasing aptitude and confidence in their work, or rejoice more in their approaching perfection. Moreover, no one knew better than he how greatly the boundless field itself, which was to be the object of their whole work, needed the greatest variety of labourers, and how certainly even the smallest toil expended upon it, if only properly set about and honestly pursued, would bring an infinite reward.

They were thus to learn to further the kingdom of God after the great example which he had shown them, and upon the foundation which he had laid. Accordingly, as in his case teaching and preaching, as we have seen,[3] was the first thing he did, but corresponding activity in helping and healing was equally important, so they had to learn to proclaim in the world the immediate coming, and, indeed, the already accom-

[1] Luke vii. 11–17.

[2] Contrary to the custom of the earlier times of the people; see *Antiquities*, p. 152.

[3] Pp. 216 sq.

plished inauguration of the glad kingdom of God with its earthly Community, and at the same time to further the great salvation of the kingdom of God by their deeds of healing and helping in every good way. The second part of their duty had necessarily in the first instance to be a continuation of the forms of helping and healing which were precisely at that time most necessary and successful, as we saw above[1] in the case of Christ himself. It is therefore quite intelligible that before he sent them out he should communicate those means of healing and of helping, the art of which, no less than skill in the employment of which, was, as we have seen,[2] possessed by him; as far as they could at all be readily communicated and could very well be applied by tyros.[3]

Nothing can be more historical than that a mission of the Twelve of this nature was once arranged by him; he could send them forth during the journey itself in which he was now engaged, as the early narrative intimates pretty clearly. But it is equally certain that he was compelled to employ a certain degree of caution not to bring them unnecessarily on this trial-journey into too great difficulties. We still know expressly that he commanded them not as yet to touch Samaritan territory. The treatment required by such districts was naturally much more difficult; and if, as we have seen,[4] he himself for good reasons confined as yet his labours almost entirely to Israel, he could now still more require this self-restriction on the part of the Twelve,[5] inasmuch as many questions might arise in these quarters the answer of which was at present far beyond their reach. Probably his desire was that they should confine themselves to the districts of Galilee, which were all of them best known to them, and where they could for the present most easily make trial of their difficult office.

And it is no less certain that before their despatch he gave them further many special instructions and exhortations, such as were specially adapted to this new situation; but none could be in this case so important and significant as those respecting the proper spiritual means which they had to employ for their

[1] Pp. 220 sq.

[2] Pp. 224 sq.

[3] It has already been remarked in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 305, and is moreover quite obvious, that this is intimated by the words Matt. x. 1, Luke x. 17.

[4] Pp. 235 sq.

[5] But it must also be said that, from the very fact that, according to the Collected Sayings, Matt. x. 3, a special admonition was given to avoid heathen ground, it is shown how easily the disciples especially might be misled to enter it and to work in it also. The temptation was presented of itself by the general position and condition of Israel in those times; and Christ himself, in fact, had already touched in several instances heathen and Samaritan districts, and had displayed his full activity in them, as was shown above.

purpose, and respecting the reception which they had to expect in the world. Neither on such an occasion could there have been wanting higher hints regarding the general Messianic avocation and experiences, or again, prophetic forecasts regarding the development of the whole Messianic endeavour in which they were now indeed about themselves to take a more immediate part. The Collected Sayings had at this place brought together everything that Christ had ever uttered in relation to the sending forth of his disciples and their reception in the world; and although many particular utterances, which he probably first made to his followers at a much later time, with the most definite prospect of immediate death,[1] may on account of a convenient connection have been received into this collected whole, these golden sayings nevertheless all belong to the profoundest and most significant that have been preserved from his mouth. For a great part of the deepest things that agitated his own breast as the very first Evangelist and Messenger of God Himself[2] to the world, and determined his entire Messianic life, must also find utterance in those words with which he encouraged the disciples to undertake the same work.

Many more special counsels he may then have given them, and many things which were required for this particular object only had to be mentioned; for instance, the length of their absence, where they would meet him again, and which direction it would be best for them individually to take. It must be an early reminiscence[3] that they were sent out two and two. The journeys of the Twelve might undoubtedly be commenced and likewise finished during that winter, since each pair could meet with and experience enough in the course of one or two months. Yet it is quite possible that separate trial-journeys of the same kind were also repeated in the following year, although we do not now find any account of them.

But it is a somewhat later idea and class of narrative which Luke[4] has received from one of his documentary sources, according to which Christ sent forth the Seventy, above[5] referred to, essentially like the Twelve, on trial-journeys.

[1] See, further, *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 305 sq.

[2] Comp. Χριστὸς ἀπόστολος Θεοῦ in Euseb. *Ecc. Hist.* vi. 14.

[3] According to Mark vi. 7, Luke x. 1, this stood incontestably in the Collected Sayings, although both Matt. x. 5 sq. and Luke ix. 1–6 omit it; yet the enumeration of the Twelve in pairs, as Matt. x. 2–4 supplies it precisely in connection with the account of their sending forth, is also in favour of the early reminiscence. On other occasions also Jesus was accustomed to despatch two of the Twelve on an errand, Mark xi. 1, Matt. xxi. 1, Luke xix. 29; as the Baptist likewise, if the reading δύο, Matt. xi. 2, were correct

[4] Luke x. 1 sq., 17 sq., comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 350 sq.

[5] P. 299.

The doubt of the Baptist, and his end.

To this period belongs, further, the last occasion in which Christ came into closer contact with the Baptist, and the earthly end of this great man, which could not remain without its influence upon the more rapid unfolding of the history of Jesus. We owe the reminiscence of this event, with its immediate consequences, which was very important in so many respects, to the Collected Sayings, from which thus one of the finest and historically most instructive pieces has been preserved.[1]

As we have seen,[2] the Baptist had been above a year in prison, and although to that time treated with some consideration, and indeed with considerable respect, by the Tetrarch Antipas, he might, in view of the arbitrary rule and wayward humours of this man, look forward hourly to his end. As in his weary confinement he now undoubtedly followed with the more intense interest anything which that man did and suffered from whom he had expected so much for Israel's salvation, so also he heard without doubt of the new arrangements which Jesus had in the meantime made in the sphere of his labours. But the fundamental hope of his life—that the Messiah would soon appear when the right way had been prepared for him—he could not as yet see fulfilled; and he did not comprehend how the new arrangements and the general procedure of him whom he had without any jealousy and with great effect assisted on his way two years and a half ago, could issue in the appearance of a Messiah such as was expected from the passages of the Old Testament. It is true he might be a little both surprised and rejoiced that Jesus was left all this time to work freely and unhindered, although he really only continued in another way the life-work which he himself had commenced; but if he as yet took less offence at the humble and sporadic character of his deeds of healing and other deeds of power, or at the less restrained and more cheerful habit of life to which he accustomed his disciples, after all, those deeds were not the mighty works which he had ultimately expected; for if he regarded them as the proper commencement of the Messianic deeds, he still supposed that the Messiah could not continue to confine himself to them; and lastly, it appeared to him time that the Messiah should openly display a greater power in the world.

[1] Matt. ch. xi., with the other passages belonging to it elsewhere preserved; see *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 310 sq.

[2] P. 269.

It may be inferred from the general condition of matters that such thoughts then agitated the noble man in his weary imprisonment, and that they were not a little provoked within him by his disciples (to whom baptising was now evidently forbidden). Accordingly, it certainly cannot be surprising that in his present gloomy circumstances and the too certain prospect of his speedy end, he should desire to receive from Jesus himself an explanation as to that which appeared to him dark and mysterious, even though he might perhaps desire it mainly for the sake of his own disciples as they now beset him; for undoubtedly all kinds of instigations on the part of those of his disciples who had not joined the followers of Jesus also produced their effect. We saw above[1] how one of these, even before the imprisonment of the Baptist, fell into a dispute with the disciples of Jesus; and after this imprisonment they must have become much more uncertain as to their position, and undoubtedly urged their master to tell them definitely whether they ought to become disciples of Jesus. In short, we see the brave first originator of the entire Messianic movement, after he had guided it for years, as he is now oppressed and cast down by all these things, resolving to send two of his disciples to Jesus, to learn from his own lips whether he is really the expected Messiah, or whether John and his disciples have to look for another.

In this message no doubt amounting to disavowal was implied: rather a challenge inciting Jesus to become at once, in its full extent, what the Baptist had formerly expected of him and was still not disinclined to expect. But it is not to be denied that a doubt as to his being in the full sense the true Messiah was involved in it. This doubting, questioning man was no longer the same John who, overpowered by the first sight of Jesus, once firmly believed that he had there and then found in him the future Messiah;[2] and we see here at a glance how vastly the time had altered meanwhile in the case of the two men, and how little the elder of the two, simply because he had remained upon his first position, had truly followed the development of the younger, which was perfectly consistent, but continually progressive and always climbing higher upon the one proper way to the goal. The doubt, however humanly excusable, must, from the divine importance of the case, have deeply pained Jesus; for, though it was almost the same doubt that was thrown out in a coarser form from so many other quarters, it must affect

[1] P. 363.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 192 sq., 244 sq.

him the more painfully that it was raised by that very man who had first called forth the entire Messianic movement of the time, and indeed had once, with joyful confidence and encouraging exclamation, recognised in himself the future Messiah, and had afterwards for a considerable time entertained no doubt regarding him; and probably at no moment of these years did the full picture of the various vicissitudes of the past, from that first meeting with the Baptist to the present hour, present itself so vividly before his soul as now.

But it was not fitting to give vent before the messengers of the Baptist to such pain and displeasure, however justifiable, or even to cause it to be told to him; no one was greater than he also in repressing justifiable displeasure. Accordingly he calmly points them to the incessant and invariable work of his daily life: how those needing help in any and even the worst form, physical as well as spiritual, are relieved and benefited by him; how that is his office and his business; and how little he labours thus in vain, they may easily see. He tells them that the further development of things is not simply his, but especially God's work; but that he is to be pronounced blessed who finds no occasion of stumbling in him, and does not, on account of the insignificant beginning of the kingdom of God, doubt the existence and the mighty movement of the kingdom itself. They might announce these things to the Baptist; and with this he had really said everything that was necessary to be said on the occasion, and upon which the Baptist and his disciples could meditate.

But after the departure of this deputation he could give freer vent before the more intimate disciples who then surrounded him, and likewise before others, to the painful thoughts which then agitated his inmost soul; and we still possess, from the Collected Sayings, the gist of his utterances, which are so wonderfully appropriate as regards the precision of their thoughts, and at the same time so transparent as regards their historical distinctiveness; they undoubtedly belong to this time, and are for us the clearest reflection of it. Who is this Baptist, and what the attitude of men towards him, both formerly and now? When people formerly went forth in great crowds towards the Jordan to the Baptist, what did they desire to see and to find in him? A doubtful man, like a reed shaken by the wind? Oh, certainly not; at that time he was not (as now) a doubtful man! But just as little could they desire to find in him an effeminate, luxurious courtier; which he is not now either, he who at all events is still, even in his doubts, a sincere man, who is a

prophet, and indeed, as the forerunner of the new Messianic age, more than one of the Old Testament prophets, and may really be regarded as the returning Elias[1] promised in the Old Testament, and who nevertheless, on the other hand, as a man now doubting with regard to the kingdom of God, which has already actually come into existence, stands far below even the least of those who do not doubt regarding it, and because they believe in it can now already be true members of it. For indeed at this very time it must be recognised as the boundary line between the Old and the New, and in this respect the Baptist forms the bridge from the first to the second, that now the kingdom of heaven, with all its powers and possessions, is really already open to everyone that conquers it, and as it were seizes possession of it (for without such daring and effort no one can receive its treasures). But if it should now prove impossible to be altered, that the Baptist with his following, the farther the kingdom of God proclaimed by him has been developed since its commencement, should not meet it at last with the greater doubt, and that he should not remain upon his own position, what in that case can be thought of the wisdom of the children of this world, who will have neither the Baptist with his rigorous severity nor the Messiah now appearing with his gentle cheerfulness, who make the most serious exceptions with respect to both the former and the latter, and indeed, even admire their own wisdom, in that they at the same time censure and reject both, unlike as they are! Truly, the divine wisdom which sent both men, and which these her over-wise children[2] desire to censure because she sent both, is best justified precisely on the part of these critics, in that they themselves do not know what they want, playing[3] childishly with the most serious things, never being satisfied, and in their constant thoughtlessness always becoming more and more unhappy. Oh, how long already, and how earnestly, had he himself sought in the most various ways to save this generation, if it could yet have been saved, and had not on the contrary been already fully devoted to destruction![4]

[1] See *ante*, p. 128.

[2] A somewhat frequent figure, as الادب وبنوه *culture and her children* —i.e. those who boast of her, *Hariri*, p. 231, last line, ed. Sacy.

[3] The children's game referred to was, according to all these indications, a game at riddles مغالّة, in which the one half, which seated represented the judge and king, had to resign its seats if it had twice failed to guess what had been proposed to it by the other active and moving half—e.g., if it had understood neither the meaning of the piping nor the weeping, and acted accordingly.

[4] In so far such words as Matt. xi. 20–24 could at that time really be uttered

In such words, passing judgment upon all the various human endeavours and divisions of the time, he expressed the pain he felt at the doubt of the Baptist which had now been declared. We do not, it is true, learn from these early and trustworthy narratives what John said to his disciples, and how he advised them when the reply of Jesus was brought to him, but we can easily infer what it was from the subsequent course of the history. Really the brief answer of Jesus was not very well adapted, even had that been its purpose, to at once set his doubts at rest; and the deeper reflection which it was intended to provoke he might previously have used. He remained, therefore, according to all that we must infer even from this consideration, in his position of doubtful waiting. But his days were numbered. Soon afterwards,[1] without doubt, the fate above mentioned[2] overtook him in his prison; and unjust and cruel as this was on the part of its human cause, it can hardly be said that from a divine point of view it occurred too early. For what was truly new and creative in the work the Baptist had been called to found had now long since been in existence and continuous operation, even without his own further labours; and that which was really divine in his aims and labours, and which had been, indeed, a necessary, and in itself infinitely significant and productive link in the development of the general history of the true religion as it was just now putting forth its greatest efforts to attain its consummation,—this, as a true hero of God, he had in his day attained. The greatest day of his labours was that on which, as we have seen,[3] he baptised Jesus; and the profoundest thing that his keen glance discovered was precisely this—that he recognised in Jesus the one man who could become the Messiah. But inasmuch as he did not recognise the one right way by which Jesus could and really did become that which he hoped from him, the ways of the two men necessarily from that very moment tended nevertheless to separate farther and farther apart, though slowly and without the slightest human fault of the Baptist. He undoubtedly did not, during the few days still left to him, withdraw the doubt which had arisen within him during his long imprisonment, otherwise his disciples would not have con-

in connection with the preceding ones; and they contain already almost the same final judgment upon Galilee as was at last uttered Matt. xxiii. 37 over Jerusalem.

[1] The Collected Sayings probably made no mention of the death of the Baptist, inasmuch as such a mention was not at all required by their scope; but it is not contrary to their meaning that his death, as Mark vi. 14–30 mentions, occurred before the return of the Twelve from their mission.

[2] Pp. 199 sq.

[3] Pp. 191 sq.

tinued his work and his whole way of regarding the future as we know they really did.[1] So he died, continuing in the doubt which had befallen him late in his career, and attesting for us in dying how difficult it really was to rise to the elevation of Christ, were it even by no more than an immovable faith; and certainly this was at that time infinitely more difficult than it is now, or than it became even in the Apostolic age. After his death in the prison had become known, his disciples fetched away his body, to pay to him the last honours; many disciples continued faithful to his teaching and his hope, although abandoning the special hope in Jesus; and precisely after his outward history was finished, his disciples could with the more determination gather together again and agree amongst themselves as to what had then to be done in order to continue his work as they understood it. In Israel generally, also, his memory continued as an ennobling influence.[2] But no one had even before his death passed so correct a judgment regarding him, and stated so purely and clearly what was divine in him, as the man in whom he came at last to doubt, and whom by this doubt he troubled; and whatever was of an immortal nature in his work could be preserved for all time in Christianity only, and has thus been preserved.

Important and instructive, however, as it is, that we are so fully informed in this manner regarding this final phase of the inner life of the Baptist by means of the valuable remains of the Collected Sayings, it is at the same time no less certain that this gradual darkening of the now setting star of the Baptist which had once shone so brightly, had no great significance as regards the pure truth of the now completely risen sun of Christianity, and indeed could henceforth exert but little influence upon its further development. It is the dark side of the Baptist, of importance for complete and truthful history, in itself instructive like everything in the life of a great hero of the race, but for the simple Christian friend and admirer of the Baptist rather to be left in obscurity and to be passed over in silence. We cannot therefore be surprised that the former disciple of the Baptist himself, the Apostle John, does not in his Gospel refer either to the death or to the slight previous darkening of the mind of the Baptist. He does not deny what the earlier Gospel histories had said about it, but is disinclined to speak about it in his own, and prefers to give greater prominence than even the earlier narratives had done to every truly

[1] See below. [2] See p. 79.

Christian characteristic that could be recorded of the Baptist, inasmuch as the disciples of John at that time undoubtedly preferred to pass over precisely the noble words which the Baptist had spoken about Jesus after his baptism, and held with exclusive partiality only by his last obscure and doubting words.[1]

(c) *The return of the Twelve and their fresh practical training.*

Not very long after that painful experience which Christ was not spared, he was destined to make another of a joyful nature which was adapted to cast a far-reaching ray of sunlight into the whole boundless future of his life-work. The Twelve returned and made a report to him of everything that they had seen, taught, and done: they were greatly rejoiced at the good results of their labours, particularly that they had even begun to learn to exorcise the evil spirits after the manner and in the name of their Master. It is true he could not express his approval of their joy without adding restriction and warning; it was the joy of tyros, and might easily prove dangerous to themselves. For long ago he had in spirit beheld 'Satan falling from heaven as lightning,'[2] which, when it has once fallen, can do no further harm, and need not be feared; this is precisely the truth of the kingdom of God now begun, that the power of Satan has in it been overcome, and he has fallen as from heaven, where he could mysteriously and by pure surprise injure men, upon the earth, where he can now be easily seen and avoided as a visible being. Christ himself has experienced quite otherwise and much earlier than they this victory over the power of Satan, indeed he first made it possible; in so far, therefore, the present joy of the Twelve at their power over the evil spirits is like that of novices. But all joy of that nature, justifiable as it may be, is the more perilous to novices inasmuch as it may easily provoke human pride in them and make them too confident. A man, therefore, should not rejoice and take courage at his victory over a hostile power, but therein alone, that he knows by faith that he is a member of the kingdom of heaven, and in spirit feels assured that he does not occupy a hostile attitude towards the pure divine powers. With such words and suitable figures[3] did he then moderate

[1] In this silence of the fourth Gospel, therefore, there is not remotely involved a reason for denying its Apostolic authorship.

[2] A figure which is repeated in a very similar sense Rev. xii. 9, and in the latter passage is simply more graphically worked out.

[3] Luke x. 18–20.

the first overflowing joy of the Twelve, just as he does this everywhere in similar instances, and henceforth the more frequently in proportion as they began to labour more independently.

Nevertheless, as soon as he has dismissed the Twelve and finds himself more alone, the bright sunshine which the experience of the commencing independence and gladness of the Twelve in active service for the kingdom of God had let in upon his soul is again reflected by him in unrestrained utterance; and as if he should now involuntarily himself supply an example of that pure joy before God which, as he had just said in the presence of the Twelve, is allowed to man, he rejoiced in prayer before God in the profoundest emotion of his spirit and in a bright clear outlook into all the future, thanking God that He had revealed the truth of the kingdom of God, now actually begun upon the earth, to those who like his disciples might rather be regarded as the still infant souls of the age, only that they possessed precisely sufficiently innocent minds to be still capable of receiving pure truths and to become genuine members of the kingdom of God, which was misunderstood by the wise and understanding of the time, and even by the Baptist. For parents there is no purer joy than that of seeing how the first germs of higher divine thought and work seek with glad eagerness to expand and develop: but still purer and brighter must have been that joy when Jesus perceived how the seed of the kingdom of God germinated in his disciples and his own spirit was about to be rejuvenated in them. His one endeavour with regard to them during this period had been to preserve their spirit from all the stereotyped errors and antiquated perversities of the time, and to make it receptive for the truths of the kingdom of God on the earth, and able and strong to labour in it, that they might confront this world as innocent children who were at the same time unyielding and diligent for the kingdom of God; he now saw the first fruits of his purest wishes and his most intense efforts ripening, was the more easily able to console himself at being misunderstood even by such men as the Baptist, and already in spirit foresaw more certainly the whole future development of his eternal life-work. And we need not ask how such joyful outbursts of his thanksgiving before God, and of his profoundest prophetic anticipation, as the Collected Sayings here present them,[1] could be heard by others and so at length recorded; his mind was not so divided between God and men, and his most secret meditations

[1] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* pp. 314 sq.

and utterances were not so hidden from even the most intimate of his disciples, that they could have remained doubtful to them also, particularly when they concerned so directly and so deeply as in this case the foundation of his whole work on the earth.

But in spite of these first results of already such a joyful nature which had attended the independent mission of the Twelve, Jesus did not consider it as yet opportune to send them out again at once upon fresh missionary journeys, as if it were his purpose to attract with greatest rapidity as many men as possible into his circle. On the contrary, he now again gathered them more closely around himself, inasmuch as they had yet so much to learn regarding the higher things of faith and their proper conduct in the midst of the difficult circumstances of their life. Mark has again made, in the more connected history of one or two days, a description similar to that which we found in him in the previous period,[1] describing this time how Jesus at this climax of his whole public life worked both for the Twelve and for the great mass of the people, and how he then appeared to them. But John[2] desires in this connection above all to expound and illustrate one of the most memorable utterances which Christ made on the occasion of the most important of the occurrences which are narrated at this point by the earlier Gospels: and it is really as if on reading the earlier Gospels, or rather one of them only (Mark), he purposely translated himself into all the circumstances of those days so as to realise them most vividly, in order that he might be able the more faithfully to report concerning the great utterances which Jesus then made. Thus at this point the two principal veins of Gospel narrative meet, in order from this height of the whole public work of Jesus to flow more and more abundantly, but each in its own living stream. John also adds here, by way of supplement, and casting a bright light upon the entire chronological sequence of the history, that the Passover was precisely at that time at hand.[3] As we can now understand those occurrences somewhat more in detail from the two sources taken together, they would take place somewhat as follows.

[1] P. 278.

[2] John ch. vi.; in connection with Mark vi. 30–56.

[3] The remark John vi. 4 was intended simply to define the time more nearly, nothing more: this is conveyed by the meaning and the position of the remark, and it can be inferred besides from the way in which the times of the feasts are always uniformly and intentionally mentioned in this Gospel generally; but it was necessary on account of the subsequent mention of the Feast of Tabernacles, vii. 2, that the Passover should be here expressly mentioned (*ante*, p. 281).

When the Twelve gathered around Jesus again, he desired to hold converse and intercourse with them for a time in a more retired place, inasmuch as the people who were going in and out seeking assistance from him where he then stayed for some time, were always such a large multitude that he could not there consider anything with them apart, and indeed the Twelve with himself scarcely found there leisure quietly to take any food.[1] Accordingly he then with them entered the boat, which was always by the Lake in readiness for such passages, that he might seek a more solitary place on the shore: but those of the great crowd who were seeking his help and teaching had at the first glance at the departing boat soon divined its goal, hastened quickly on foot to the place, and even anticipated those who landed from the boat. Thus Mark narrates:[2] and without doubt this place, which is not once even more definitely mentioned by him, must be conceived as situated on the same shore and not very far from Capernaum, and as one often visited by Jesus on previous occasions, since we may properly suppose that the people on foot sought to get there before him also because they knew that he had previously often been there. We may therefore properly suppose a locality near Bethsaida on the north-west of the Lake.[3] However, he might have reasons for not making a long stay now precisely in the Galilean neighbourhood of Capernaum, as we shall soon see further, and we suppose that he sailed as soon as possible thence to the opposite shore. When John, therefore, supposes forthwith a locality on the further shore of 'the Lake of Galilee of Tiberias,'[4] he thus related this from definite recollection, but compressing everything into a briefer form; every excuse for seeking to deny which is wanting.[5] He thus went with the

[1] The words *οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν*, Mark vi. 31, as referring to the Twelve with Christ, are thus explained also from iii. 20.

[2] Mark vi. 33.

[3] See *ante*, p. 252.

[4] John vi. 1: it might thus be called in distinction from the more northern smaller lake, as far as which also Galilee still extended; but in that case the name 'Lake of Tiberias,' John xxi. 1, would be shorter.

[5] With this supposition accords perfectly well that the subsequent return sail was to Bethsaida, according to Mark vi. 45; and it is, as we have seen, p. 253, safer always to suppose in the Gospels, wherever at all possible, that the western Bethsaida is intended. When accordingly Luke ix. 10 speaks of the solitary place itself for which Jesus now sailed as situated near Bethsaida, that is quite appropriate, and Luke may still have read this name in his Mark at this place. In fact it is hard to suppose that Luke perhaps adopted here the name of the town simply from Mark vi. 45, although it may be allowed that already Matt. xiv. 13 found in Mark no definite name to the locality. And it is equally plain that the *M'pharsho*, with some other ancient documents, omitted the name here simply because it was not found in the other Gospels. With regard to all these considerations, it is a great disadvantage that the long passage after Luke ix. 17 from Mark, referred to in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 96, in which were included the

Twelve to a solitary place in the chain of hills on the eastern shore.[1]

But neither here could he be much alone with the Twelve: and seized with compassion for 'the sheep having no shepherd,' he devoted himself here again in teaching and healing to the necessities of the masses of the people. Thus engaged, he and the multitude that hung about him were overtaken by the coming evening: and the Twelve reminded him that he should dismiss the people in time, that they might go into the surrounding villages and buy there food for themselves. But he, who had thus far satisfied them so much with higher food that they hung upon him as if they had forgotten time and place, wishes in this unexpected appearance of want, to impart to them also food of a lower kind: and inquires of the shrewdly intelligent Apostle Philip where bread can be bought for them;[2] but Philip supposes that it is hardly possible for a large sum of money to buy enough for the five thousand people. As meanwhile Andrew finds at a food-seller's in the neighbourhood five loaves and two fishes, Jesus considers even this small supply as sufficient to feed the great multitude in this solitude, commands them to sit down, takes the food and divides it, as in faith and thanksgiving he looks up to heaven, and they are not only all satisfied, but there remain most abundant fragments after the meal. Thus he satisfies, infinitely more than the Twelve hitherto understand and at all conjecture, the necessities of the needy; and if the power of his spirit is surprising, the whole occurrence is intended only to teach his genuine disciples how much the higher faith is still wanting to them, that faith which least of all doubts genuine love when want is great, and which when connected with that love redoubles everything in glad giving and distribution, and suddenly there is abundance instead of want.

We have here, therefore, a similar narrative to that of the wedding feast at Cana:[3] only that in the present instance the miracle is greater in proportion as the labours of Christ

words Mark vi. 45, is now at all events wanting in Luke. But on the supposition that Luke found the word in his Mark we must suppose that now between Mark vi. 33 and ver. 34 a sentence has been lost which stated that Jesus did not desire at that time to stay longer near Bethsaida than his most necessary business required, but took boat from thence to the eastern shore.

[1] According to John vi. 3, 15.

[2] When John vi. 6 supposes that Jesus put this question to Philip merely to prove him, that is a view of this Apostle's of an utterance originally made by Jesus similar to that described above, p. 256 sq.; it was only after a late recollection of it that such an interpretation could arise under the feeling of the greatness of Christ which was then before the mind of an Apostle.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 249 sq.

generally have grown since their first commencement, and now include within their scope many thousands. And in this case we are able also without difficulty to prove how old and firmly established the narrative is. For essentially the same narrative, varying only in a few unimportant circumstances, is brought even by so early an Evangelist as Mark into his series of narratives at another and somewhat later place:[1] but in the latter instance also, which is very important and a sign of its real origin and early date, its scene is the same solitary region on the eastern shore of the Lake, and as regards everything that concerns the Twelve and their weak faith, accords so perfectly with the first account that we cannot possibly suppose that in the material sense the occurrence really took place twice. And this reminiscence belongs undoubtedly to the earliest stratum of Gospel narratives, received early a more definite form, but was soon retold so variously as regards minor points that a collector like Mark, who put together all the narratives he met with, could at the same time adopt and suitably place in two distinct groups of narratives two somewhat differing forms of it, as if the occurrence itself had been repeated. We cannot now state more definitely what was the first occasion giving rise to a narrative which really simply teaches, in addition to what has already been said, how Jesus with the smallest material resources, but infinitely more still by his spirit and his word and prayer, most marvellously satisfied physically also all those who came to him on that evening as to their fatherly provider,[2] and how the spiritual blessing may naturally be followed by the physical. Probably also the infinitely blessed feeling of the higher satisfaction given by the bread of life which the disciples ate after Christ's resurrection, as broken and distributed to them by the Lord himself, had insensibly a great influence upon the very peculiar development of the tradition, as if Christ himself while still on the earth had once broken and distributed with his blessing such marvellously satisfying bread of life to a great multitude of people.[3]

[1] Mark viii. 1–9: Matt. also repeats both narratives from Mark, and in Luke the second is wanting simply on account of the great hiatus before mentioned (p. 336), which occurs in his Gospel precisely after this narrative.

[2] Precisely this meaning was evidently most present to the Apostle when he says, John vi. 5, *ἐπάρας οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς . . . . καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτόν.*

[3] Precisely therefore in the earliest form of narrative, Mark vi. 52, viii. 14–21, the singularly high significance of this bread of life is also brought strongly forward on other occasions. It is further undoubtedly on this account that the blessing and breaking of the bread is always so distinctly mentioned, Mark vi. 41, viii. 6. Neither can John, ch. vi., have arbitrarily brought forward the relation of this bread to the purely heavenly food (see below). In this way too the development of the similar narrative of the wine

But it is not surprising, after such a day of most unexpected and intense labour, that he desired in the evening to be alone; moreover, according to John, there was the excitement of the masses, who desired to claim him and 'make of him a king,' accordingly to drag him down from his pure elevation to the low level of the life of that time: thus seductive is the reception of physical benefits. But only the more zealously does he withdraw from them, urges the Twelve to row back to Bethsaida,[1] dismisses the people and departs alone into the hills for solitary prayer. There from his elevation, with his watchful eye he discerns them towards morning[2] contending with a contrary wind in the middle of the Lake:[3] to note this and rescue them is with him one act, and even to the midst of the sea reaches his delivering arm of love. But his presence and his approaching help are so greatly mistaken, particularly in the dark night, that they suppose the form which hastens over the water to their help, and indeed almost past them,[4] is only an apparition, and instead of meeting him with higher faith are simply terrified at him. So little, therefore, were they as yet habituated to higher faith in great mortal peril, in spite of all their previous experiences! Not until he himself entered the boat and addressed them reassuringly was, according to the earlier narrative, the wind stilled: and then their amazement at the storm was changed into a still greater amazement at the power of their Master. Into the somewhat later form of the narrative, as the present Gospel of Matthew explains it,[5] there is interwoven a mention of the behaviour of Peter towards Christ in this great mortal trial, as generally from this time forth this special relation between that Apostle and his Master is often referred to, and as it cannot be doubted that Christ precisely from his present elevated relation to the Twelve always directed special attention to the attitude of Peter as the most highly esteemed and most powerful character amongst the Twelve, and that he sought to train him above all the others to a really rock-firm faith. In this sense accordingly it was narrated on

(*ante*, pp. 249 sq.) can be explained. Further, comp. what has to be said on this point in the next volume.

[1] It has but little significance that Matt. xiv. 22 quite omits this name from Mark vi. 45. But John vi. 17, 24, 59 uses for it immediately Capernaum, in this case also simply abbreviating the narrative (as appears from what follows); and John might prefer according to vi. 59 to name Capernaum at once, because he preferred to connect the following long discourse of Jesus with the Synagogue of Capernaum as with the chief scene on other occasions of such Galilean discourses.

[2] 'About the fourth night-watch, Mark vi. 48: not narrated by John so graphically.

[3] This is, 'when they had rowed twenty-five or thirty stadia,' John vi. 19.

[4] This is implied in the words *καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς*, Mark vi. 48, which the last author of Matt. omits.

[5] Matt. xiv. 28–31.

this occasion also that Peter recognised before any others the nearness of the Lord as he was approaching even over the sea to their help, and desired for the strengthening of his own faith to walk with him likewise upon the waves of the sea and thus to meet him, but that when this had been permitted to him by the Lord he was seized in the midst of the danger by fear, and found refuge only in the outstretched hand of his Lord. An exceedingly expressive illustration also of the entire subsequent behaviour of Peter! But John narrates quite briefly in conclusion, evidently carrying out most fully the original significance of the tradition, that the Twelve had desired to receive him into the boat, but at that moment it flew all the more swiftly with the suddenly favouring wind to the land.[1] So favourably operates even his simple presence, and how little does he himself need human help! And thus this narrative precisely at this place undoubtedly teaches nothing else than how the Twelve must learn fearlessly to defy, when they are alone by themselves also, the greatest danger of the world,[2] after they had learnt on the previous passage, as we have seen,[3] to meet it first always in his immediate presence.

However, when at last, according to the earlier narrative, they reach the shore and land after such perils in the night, they find themselves driven 'into the land Gennesaret,' accordingly after all somewhat more to the south than Bethsaida, where they really desired to land.[4] But hardly have they landed there when he is here again recognised, and his hours and days slip away also in passing through these districts as fresh crowds needing his help in every form flock to him. With this the more connected illustrations by which the earlier narrative described the daily movements and occupations of Jesus during this period are brought to a close.

But John desired in this case, taking as his basis a great utterance which he undoubtedly once heard Jesus make in the Synagogue of Capernaum before the assembled people, rather to present elaborately the great truth of what Christ meant by the eternal bread in opposition to such material food and physical eating, and the way by which man may receive such eternal bread. Accordingly, he relates further, that the next

[1] See now, more in detail, *Die Johanneischen Schriften*, i. 228 sq.

[2] This is plainly conveyed by the close of the narrative, Mark vi. 52, which the present Matt. omits; whilst John vi. 16–21 only briefly refers to this danger on the sea on account of the transition to the following narrative.

[3] *Ante*, pp. 316 sq.

[4] Thus the mention of the 'land Gennesaret,' Mark vi. 53, Matt. xiv. 34, is really most easily explained; and thus the situation of the localities given above, p. 336, is confirmed.

day people on the eastern shore, desirous of other benefactions of like kind, observed to their astonishment that the one boat in which Jesus had arrived with his disciples was no longer there, whilst Jesus himself also, who had nevertheless been seen the previous evening to retire into the hills, was no more to be found on that shore: that then, since there were accidentally other boats from Tiberias not far off and they wished to return, the people sailed in them to the western side and sought Jesus near Capernaum; that as they then curiously asked him, as in amazement, when he had then come thither, he himself, intuitively perceiving that they merely desired to enjoy further his material benefactions, and on that account followed him so eagerly, at once turned their attention in his discourse to the true bread of life, and subsequently, as they had taken offence, continued this discourse in the Synagogue itself of Capernaum.[1]

This great discourse itself is distinguished from the earlier long discourses in John simply by the fact that it is the first the subject-matter of which belongs to this period of the height of the public labours of Jesus. Only when the Messiah has already devoted himself with his entire spirit, his word and his work, to the world, as is now the case when his work has already made such progress, can it be maintained that his word as he now generally communicates it to the world, or indeed that he himself with his whole life and being as he has appeared in the world in his brightness, is when received in faith that truly satisfying bread which, unlike that material bread sought from him by the people, imparts endless life and immortality. The discussion here presented by John simply works out this thought in all its aspects, the short questions and objections, the doubts and astonishment of men, only serving, quite after John's customary manner, more strongly to confirm the great truth itself in its utmost consequences,[2] and every interruption of Christ's discourse bringing out more clearly its meaning to its loftiest climax. The eternal bread alone, as it is now presented to men,[3] must be obtained, namely, by faith in him who offers it,[4] that faith which, without re-

[1] That is, we may probably best suppose from John vi. 59, comp. with vv. 24, 25, that the second part of the discussions here recorded, vv. 41–59, is meant to belong to the Synagogue, since the first part is appropriate only for the first meeting of Jesus and the people.

[2] It is therefore better not to seriously raise here such questions as why the people, according to John vi. 30, after all the signs which had just been given, should immediately demand one again.

[3] John vi. 26, 27: we distinguish here the constituent parts of the thought according to the plan of its development, as they are presented plainly enough even in outward form.

[4] Vv. 28, 29.

quiring physical miracles, knows that that is alone the celestial bread which, coming from heaven in quite a different way from the manna of Moses, communicates life to the world,[1] and that this bread of life is the true properly understood Messiah himself.[2] If it appears too incomprehensible or too loftily uttered, that the Messiah himself is this bread of life, it must, on the contrary, be maintained as a further consequence (and with this the discourse, as in a second higher stage, passes on even to the explanation of the mystery of sacrifice, as the Apostolic age saw this perfected in Christ), that if the true Messiah is such simply thereby that he gives his flesh and blood for the life of the world, precisely this flesh,[3] yea, this blood,[4] is alone the food from heaven giving immortality, without eating and drinking of which no man can receive the true life. But inasmuch as the thought of this discourse passes thereby insensibly into the time when Christ had already really sacrificed his life for the world, and could not therefore be easily understood by hearers previous to that time, it takes a turn of itself at the end by the question, whether its truth will then be still doubted when Christ has actually been glorified by death and resurrection, and when faith will be much more difficult, inasmuch as everything material will disappear, and unbelief also will be much less excusable, inasmuch as then the highest conceivable miracle will have been accomplished? Only he whom the spirit moves by faith can comprehend this at any time;[5] and at least the Twelve, with Peter at their head, are ready thus to believe, although Christ himself knows better than they how difficult this faith is in its actual manifestation, even amongst themselves![6] Thus this discussion, inasmuch as it is the first belonging to such an elevation of the entire public work of Christ, conducts completely up to that summit of all knowledge and conception of him where only the firmest and highest faith is adequate to enable the climber to stay, and where precisely for that reason unbelief is so easy even amongst those who desire to reach the elevation. And great as is the freedom used by John in the reproduction of this long discourse and discussion, really from this time,

[1] Vv. 30–33.
[2] Vv. 34–40.
[3] Vv. 41–51.
[4] Vv. 52–58: the words of these two members, or of the second main section, are unintelligible if we do not think in connection with them of the flesh and blood of Christ as it was regarded in the Apostolic age; hence the subsequent turn and limitation of the thought, vv. 60–65, becomes intelligible in this way alone.
[5] Vv. 60–65; with ver. 62 comp. viii. 28.
[6] Vv. 66–71; with which John presents in his way what is narrated in the earlier Gospels Matt. xvi. 16–19.

according to the earlier Gospels also, the point on which everything turns is essentially belief or unbelief in the Messiah who has now already almost sufficiently shown himself, but particularly that higher faith with which the Twelve and all who approach similarly near to him must become familiar, and which is quite another faith than that of the first beginners and those who merely seek his assistance.

3. *The continually increasing and extended journeys with the Twelve.*

But whilst the training of the Twelve to become the nucleus of a true Community of the perfect religion was being thus incessantly prosecuted at this time by Jesus with growing success, the sultry clouds of the tempest of death were already gathered above his head in increasingly threatening masses. For however much he sought in this period still granted to him to confine himself, as we have seen,[1] purely to the training of the Twelve and to leave to the world no excuse for making opposition to him, this world nevertheless perceived more and more plainly that even his most quiet and silent work really threatened its very existence with the most weird peril. And if this peril might still seem to it but very obscurely impending when it was necessary to describe it more particularly, the world involuntarily felt its magnitude to be so much the greater, inasmuch as everything that proceeded from him, even the smallest and most useful things for suffering humanity, always proceeded at the same time from an entirely different spirit than that which animated the prevailing powers at the time. There is not another utterance which describes more briefly and plainly this entire situation as it had gradually been developed than that which, according to John,[2] he himself made during this period to those who did not occupy exactly a hostile position towards him but still were indifferent and unsympathetic—'*The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth, because I testify of it that its works are evil.*' It was not necessary that he should even so much as testify this aloud in so many words: his whole life and labours and every slightest simple utterance of his lips bore this testimony.

It was about this time that his immediate ruler, Antipas, occupied his mind for the first time particularly with regard to him. Antipas had undoubtedly heard of him previously; his

[1] Pp. 295 sq.
[2] John vii. 7, comp. xv. 18, 19, 24, 25, xvii. 14.

deeds of healing more than his teaching had long ago spread his name through the land; but it is not at all surprising, according to what we have seen before,[1] that the masses of the people formed very different conceptions of his real character, and sought to explain the enigma of his appearance in very various ways. In any case the general popular understanding looked for something unusual and wonderful in him; but the last conclusion to which many came, as we have seen,[2] was that he was the Messiah. But everybody could easily know that he and several of his nearest disciples were from the school of the Baptist, or at all events that his aim was similar to that of the Baptist, and that he accomplished more in pursuance of it than John. Thus many supposed that he was the promised Elias; others that he was at least Jeremiah risen from the dead;[3] others were satisfied to regard him simply as some prophet, without beholding in him the resurrection of one who was dead.[4] But the most alarming idea of him was that which now formed itself in the mind of Antipas: he feared that in Jesus the Baptist whom he had slain was risen again, and that this was the explanation of his miraculous powers.[5] Thus the evil consciousness of his own guilt allied itself in his mind with the obscure superstition of the time; and in such a breast as his how far was this tormenting view of Jesus from the command to throw him likewise into prison and to execute him as he had executed the Baptist shortly before? or if he did not do this at once, he abstained from it for the time undoubtedly only from a dark uneasy dread, just as from this he suffered the Baptist to lie so long in prison. But he tried at least the cunning trick of a fox at this very time, in order that he might remove him from his territory. Some Pharisees were induced, with apparently good intentions, to advise him to depart, inasmuch as the Tetrarch sought to kill him.[6] The words which he then sent back to 'this fox,' who had thus not even openly applied to him, have an unmistakable similarity to those in which, as we have seen,[7] he answered the last deputation of the Baptist. He declared briefly what the present duty of his life was, and that he would not suffer himself to be hindered in its prosecution, plainly as the Divine voice foretold to him that he would soon enough be obliged to leave Galilee, not from fear of Antipas, but for wholly different reasons.

[1] Pp. 229 sq.
[2] P. 230.
[3] Comp. vol. v. p. 171, note 2.
[4] Mark vi. 15, comp. viii. 28, Matt. xvi. 14, and the remarks above, pp. 127 sq.
[5] Mark vi. 14–16.
[6] Luke xiii. 31–33.
[7] P. 329.

In reality, far more than this semi-heathen prince, it was the heads of the existing Hagiocracy itself, with their proud seat in Jerusalem and widely spread troops of Pharisees and other scholastics, whose hostility was constantly growing hotter, because their pretended religion was more and more reduced to straits by his perfect true one. His requirement was not, like that of the Baptist, simply a preparation for a new better time; he required a prompt entrance upon the duties of the kingdom of God; and he did not as the Baptist provoke by isolated rigorous utterances the wrath of the rulers of the world; he laboured calmly as a king in his own kingdom, which, though in the midst of the world, was still far above it. Accordingly, there was not kindled against him, as against the Baptist, a partial, a considerate and insulated wrath; the Hagiocracy itself, as the great centre of the true religion as it had then been developed in its most rigid shape, according to all the defects which still adhered to it, felt that it alone was assailed most directly and most strongly by him, and could not as it was exist together with him if it sought to maintain itself against him. This Hagiocracy was the entire spiritual power of the nation of the true religion, and by that religion the profoundest power of the whole world at that time; it had risen upon the basis of the most sublime truths, and, proud of an equally exalted and unparalleled history of many centuries, easily failed to see its own defects; it had, a few years before, been suddenly attacked by the Baptist, and then it was far more closely pressed by this Galilean; and it supposed that it would be able, by putting an end to the work of this man from Galilee, which did not seem difficult, to destroy also his following, which was after all mainly Galilean. A measure, which they might suppose to be a mild one, had already been taken against him by the heads of the Hagiocracy, though it did not include for the present his public adherents; they had, as we have seen,[1] suspended over him the smaller excommunication; and it appears that they gradually included the Galilean Synagogues also within the range of this punishment, just as his public adherents also were from this time more and more seriously threatened with it, and to some extent already actually came under it.[2] But since this punishment was not of much use to them, they caused him and his most intimate disciples to be more narrowly watched, that they might lay hold of matter for fresh accusations.

[1] Pp. 292 sq.

[2] We see all this from the purely incidental remarks John vii. 13, 21, ix. 22, 34, 35, xii. 42, comp. xvi. 1; but according to the earlier Gospels also, Jesus does not again enter a Synagogue from this time.

This storm which now, notwithstanding all his innocence and all his reserve, rose against him with increasing violence could not for a long time past have been unexpected by him he had from the very first known what he himself, and what the world sought; and after he had laid the foundation of his Community, the most destructive sting of the world's rage and the injury it could inflict had been extracted. But it was still necessary that he should evade its hostility as long as possible, that he might as long as possible continue the difficult work which he had commenced in the formation of his Community; for it has already appeared how much had yet to be done here subsequent to the first successful beginnings, and with how great difficulty the higher faith became quite habitual among his nearest disciples. Nevertheless, in consequence of the constantly growing suspicion and anger of his enemies on all sides, it was henceforth impossible that he should stay in one place in future for any length of time. Accordingly, from this time he undertook with the Twelve more frequent and more extended journeys, even as far as the more remote boundaries of the sacred land, and was able thus the more easily to habituate the Twelve, amid the numerous unforeseen events of every day, to that higher faith and that steadfastness of mind generally in which they were still lacking, also at the same time to bring help to all the more people that were deserving of his kind assistance. Indeed, it is as if the spirit had urged him to visit quietly all the other chief parts of the entire country, to call which to the perfect true religion while there was time was his most immediate work. But the more his life-work thus approached completion, the more closely must he permit the Twelve also to glance both into the whole power and the true nature of the hostility of the world with its ruling authorities, and also into the divine necessity of his approaching death, which was quite clear to him alone; and if for the latter object brief hints in his more profound instructions sufficed, for the former object emphatic utterances were required on every suitable occasion. We find that, for good reasons, the warnings of Christ against the perversities of the predominant schools became more frequent, intentional, and pointed only towards the end of his time; it is not until after his work has entered fully and clearly into the world, that the world on its part presents to him increasingly pronounced opposition; and it is only now that the Twelve also are sufficiently prepared more completely to understand and more justly to estimate this opposition.

a. *The distant journeys in the North.*

They occupied, at all events, the entire summer of his last year; and we know a good deal about them from Mark, only that the manner of narration peculiar to this Evangelist must not in this case either be overlooked. Christ still continued to prefer Galilee, and travelled through it with the Twelve in the most opposite directions, so that, besides the Decapolis,[1] he also touched the north-eastern neighbouring countries, which were then ruled over by the benign Tetrarch Philip; especially as his residence in Galilee under Antipas grew constantly more insecure. The frequent passage of the Lake, and the constant journeys to the three different territories that bordered on it, show how hastily his foot had now to pass over the earth; and undoubtedly we have in these perpetual crossings of the Lake, for the most part, quite reliable reminiscences.

1. While he was still staying in the district of Gennesaret above referred to,[2] some Pharisees and Scribes just come from Jerusalem made it a reproach against him that his disciples did not strictly observe the laws regarding bodily purification;[3] but he seized this occasion both to establish before them and the people generally, and particularly the Twelve, the true view, to regard everything pure or impure in relation to the inward man, and also to show the entire perversity of the Pharisaic doctrines and rules of life generally.

He departed thence to the north-west, crossing the borders of the ancient city of Tyre, and entered a house with the intention of staying there somewhat longer, but desiring to remain quite unknown. However, a heathen woman, Greek by education, though born in that neighbourhood, soon hastened to him to beg from him as the Messiah, of whose power she had heard, the cure of her daughter, who was possessed by an evil spirit. At first he would have nothing at all to say to her; so much the more she clung to the Twelve, who were assembled before the house, so that even they, moved with pity, besought him to give her a decisive answer. Then he declared to her that he was not sent unto the heathen, but to 'the lost sheep of Israel,' who had a nearer claim upon his help. But as she succeeded in removing this obstacle also by the most modest humility, touched by such genuine faith he listened to her petition. So

[1] *Ante*, p. 317.
[2] P. 340.
[3] See *Antiquities*, pp. 146 sq. The entire passage Mark vii. 1–23 is remarkable, inasmuch as it shows how Mark composed such didactic passages independently of the Collected Sayings.

little, therefore, will he deny to the heathen either a share in his gifts and so keep them from his kingdom (for the latter is found wherever the former are in operation), if they, as is meet, overcome with a proportionately stronger faith the greater hindrances that separate them from it! Indeed, it is as if he sought intentionally to give a plain example of this, in that he turned into these districts with a mainly heathen population. We met, however, with a quite similar case above.[1]

The journey was then continued still further northwards into the ancient territory of Sidon, as far as ever portions of the people of Israel had once settled in these districts which had been again occupied principally by heathen. But thence he turned back again in a south-easterly direction, going probably to the north of the Lake of Galilee over the Jordan, then east of the latter into the district of the Decapolis, accordingly likewise amongst a principally heathen population. Here he healed a deaf and dumb man, according to a process of healing which was above referred to;[2] but it was in vain that he forbad most earnestly those who had brought the man to him to be healed to say nothing of the cure; from astonishment they could not refrain. A second feeding of the multitude, of which we have already spoken,[3] is also placed in this region.

2. Passing over from the eastern side of the Lake, he went into 'the parts of Dalmanutha,' by which probably south-western Galilee is meant.[4] The Pharisees did not leave him here either in peace: they demanded of him a sign, but only to lead him into temptation. He refused decidedly to consider such demands of unbelief as it appeared under the mantle of faith, and explained, probably at that time with special purpose, how such demands of miraculous signs were generally to be estimated. The Collected Sayings, and still more John, interpret very clearly the sense of his answers to such demands: but no utterance of this kind from his mouth readily took deeper hold than this—'only one great sign will be given to this generation

[1] P. 313; compare also pp. 265 sq., 268 sq.

[2] Pp. 224 sq.

[3] P. 338.

[4] It is true Jerome *de loc. Hebr.* supposes that the *Magedan*, which is found instead of Dalmanutha Matt. xv. 39, was near Gerasa on the other side Jordan, in which case Μαγέδ 1 Macc. v. 26, 36, might be compared; but according to Mark vii. 31, comp. viii. 13, 22, 27, we cannot in the case of viii. 10 think of any district not on the western side of Jordan. Supposing that Magedan (comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 330 sq.) is identical with Megiddo, as this appears in Josephus also, *Ant.* viii. 6. 1, ix. 6. 3 in most MSS. written with one δ, and as the M'pharsho here supposes Megiddo, then probably Dalmanutha is only the Galilean way of pronouncing the name of the town צלמון, where according to the Mishna כלאים iv. 9, יבמות xvi. 6 many Jews dwelt, and which on account of its numerous vineyards must probably be sought in southern Galilee.

sorely against its own will, but on that account the more surprisingly and overwhelmingly, the sign of the ancient prophet Jonah.'[1] Just as this prophet returned from the depths of the sea that he might both by his own person and his remarkable history speak the more powerfully as a witness for the truth of his words, so he also will after his visible destruction return only to speak to this generation with stronger words: this idea, the truth of which we shall see fulfilled marvellously enough, had now long been certain to his mind.

Tired of such perverse demands, he escaped again over the Lake to the eastern shore: and the early narrative preserved a memorable utterance of his on this journey. They proposed to betake themselves again to that solitary district which has been already twice mentioned, on the eastern shore: but the Twelve had in the hasty departure taken only one loaf with them, and forgotten all other supplies: a circumstance first observed when they were in the boat. Thereupon he spoke to them of the leaven of the Pharisees and Herodians, and how they must beware of it: so full was his heart still of displeasure at those who had made such perverse demands, who thereby only betrayed their own insincere hearts, whilst the members of the kingdom of God must always have as pure hearts as if they were constantly solemnising Easter with pure food after all the old leaven had been carefully put away. But they supposed that he meant, as they had forgotten to take bread, only to warn them against receiving any that had been leavened from the Pharisees: and for the third time they required the most earnest admonition to let such low considerations and cares go. For evidently this piece of narrative was intended to complete the series which had been begun with the two pieces referred to above: even a small loaf easily suffices for them all, and it is better to forget the too anxious provision for material things than to forget and misunderstand higher things.[2]

They would naturally stay for a time in this solitary place: when subsequently on the same side beyond the Jordan they went into a small town the name of which is now somewhat doubtful,[3] a blind man was brought to him, whom he healed,

[1] Matt. xii. 39, xvi. 4; Luke xi. 29, 30, all passages from the Collected Sayings; and although the words Matt. xii. 40 are first added in this particular form in our present Matt. (comp. on these words vol. vi. p. 65 sq. [German]), yet the sense of the utterance is not doubtful.

[2] Comp. further the remarks above, pp. 337 sq.

[3] The ordinary reading Mark viii. 22 has Bethsaida: and it is to be regretted that this entire narrative, vv. 22–26, has been omitted not only in Luke but also in Matt. If Bethsaida were the original reading, we should have to consider the north-eastern place of this name was intended, inasmuch as we saw that the connection of the entire previous narra-

but in order to avoid attracting attention charged him strictly to remain at home and not even to let himself be much seen in his own village.

3. From this place, keeping all along on the east of the Lake and the Jordan, he visited also the extreme north-east of Palestine, going on until he came where on the gradually rising mountain summits around the then newly built Cæsarea Philippi,[1] the sources of the Jordan take their rise; yet without entering this capital city, he stayed longer in the smaller villages. Thus far therefore had he now, if not as yet openly, still palpably enough, been pursued and chased by the rulers of the people of the true religion, driven to the furthest point of the land. The divine lot which had been determined for him revealed itself as regards its more precise course of fulfilment with increasing clearness to his soul's gaze, and long ago he had prepared himself for the worst; but he felt no less sure that it was high time to let even the worst and most painful expectations that he had formed concerning his own relation to the world become gradually clear to the Twelve also, in order that they might learn in due time the duties of the true members of the Community of the perfect true religion in this aspect also.

For the first time he now voluntarily raised in the circle of the Twelve the question regarding his own real nature: the various views which had been taken concerning him in Israel were discussed, but Peter expressed solemnly in the name of all his rock-firm conviction, that he was the Messiah. Certainly it is remarkable that John connects this solemn declaration of Peter, as was above indicated,[2] with an earlier occasion: however, there might easily be several such moments when this conviction more powerfully flashed through the hearts of the Twelve and also sought an enthusiastic expression in outspoken words, although the various Evangelical narrators could have different views as to which of such

tive pointed to the eastern shore, and cannot think of a passage of the Lake in connection with the words viii. 22, comp. iii. 20. But the northern Bethsaida cannot be supposed for the reason that at that time it had become, as we have seen, p. 72, a great flourishing town and could by no means be called a κώμη as this is, ver. 26. Therefore the reading Bethany, which was found in ancient MSS., really appears more correct; we can then quite well suppose the same small place on the other side of the northern Jordan is meant, with which Jesus, as we have seen, p. 198, was acquainted from an early period. Indeed, as we know from John x. 40 comp. i. 28, that Christ really stayed here for some time in the last months of his life, it is very possible that Mark after his accustomed manner refers here to this stay occurring at so late a time, without fixing the time more definitely. In that case some points in the following narrative could be more particularly determined; comp. further below.

[1] *Ante*, p. 72.

[2] P. 342.

moments was the most exalted and memorable. The moment before us was distinguished by the fact that Jesus himself called forth this confession without any outward inducement: but the great question had necessarily to be most seriously dealt with amongst them at some time, and at the right time he found within himself sufficient occasion to bring it forward.

It could not be otherwise than that such a free joyous confession should also profoundly gladden his own soul: for the second time he thus experienced that pure joy which at an earlier period, as we have seen,[1] the joy of the Twelve in their and his life-work had prepared for him; but while in that case they could exult over the success of their first essays in their work, now it was the pure faith which embraces the whole future and forms the condition of all higher gladness that declared itself by Peter's inspired lips. Only when this faith exists has the basis of an exhaustless activity for the kingdom of God, and therefore for an endlessly fruitful activity in its Community, been really laid firm as a rock; and when this rock-firm faith now greeted him thus spontaneously and joyously from the midst of the Community of the perfect true religion which had now long been founded, there was afresh presented for him such a moment of purest joy, and indeed one of the most rapturous outlooks into the whole infinite progress of his Messianic life-work. And nevertheless, according to the Collected Sayings and the earlier form of Gospel narration,[2] he strictly forbad them to speak of him as the Messiah, particularly in such loud tones of joy; on the contrary, he declared to them just then the profoundly painful and yet divinely determined lot that awaited the Messiah in the world; indeed, when Peter at the beginning of this unexpected turn of the conversation immediately whispered in his ear, that he would do better not to speak of such things, so little did he suffer himself to be hindered by this from perfectly clearly uttering everything which he had then to say, that on the contrary he at once openly repeated before all the Twelve the same painful anticipation in its deeper truth, and explained the duties which the kingdom of God imposes upon every one of its members in view of that and every similar great crisis. So little had he therefore raised that question as to the true nature of his appearance and authority in the world merely in order to call

[1] P. 333.

[2] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 334 sq. The original narrative of Mark probably passed from Φιλίππου viii. 27 after a few intermediate words at once to ix. 14; for this reason amongst others, that the reminiscence ix. 30, 31 only then receives a perfectly natural and primary meaning.

forth the above confession; and thus closely is the painful foreboding, which the same thought of the future produced, associated in his mind with the joyful anticipation which that confession called up; but thus clearly he brings forward the painful foreboding also, and prepares his friends to meet with the proper weapons the dangers he foresees. And similarly in the narrative in John,[1] above referred to, there is again nothing so closely associated in his mind with the joyful exclamations of the disciples as the thought of the dark lot of the betrayal which is already lying in wait amongst the Twelve.

But the Twelve can listen to such painful forebodings and most solemn exhortations at most only in silence at present: and thus originates an oppressive contradiction between that joyful faith of theirs in the great salvation about to arise in Jesus, and these his mournful forebodings. This contradiction cannot be reconciled by anything in their past experience; yet to pure faith, to that faith which has already become firm as a rock, at least in the case of some of them, it becomes possible to overcome even this contradiction. The faith which is already permeated by the celestial truth and is again directed to it alone, is able nevertheless to behold as surely and certainly that glorification and that victory of a divine life-work which is still hidden by the darkness and calamities of time as if they had already been actually accomplished. But in the present case the life-work of Christ on earth had then been in reality substantially completed with the rock-firm foundation of his Community, although the final conclusion, and as it were the outer covering of his work, had still to be added. Accordingly the inner grandeur and glorious perfection of his work had already been revealed; and though its outward completion could as yet not be discerned by any eye of sense, the eye of the spirit could nevertheless already behold it; and if that could not as yet be done easily, or constantly, or by many with equal clearness, still at all events in higher moments and by a few chosen spirits. Moreover, if spiritual things generally can at first only for brief moments be descried quite clearly and as shining in their heavenly glory, how marvellously surprising and entrancing is then the first moment of this splendour, when mortal man is, as far as he can bear it, for the first time surprised by the radiant image, that irresistibly comes before him, of the eternal consummation of the

[1] John vi. 70, 71.

kingdom of God, and what his spirit within already beholds as absolutely certain thus comes before him in radiance from without as well!

This is the greatness and the lasting significance of the story of the Transfiguration, which is properly introduced precisely at this point, when at all events the three most intimate disciples of Jesus behold him suddenly transfigured upon a high mountain,[1] whither he had taken them, and discoursing with Elias and Moses, and hear him proclaimed aloud as the Messiah by a celestial voice from the cloud that again carries off the two prophets. A second sublime moment after the baptism of Jesus has now become possible for the earth; but if the heavens were opened for the first time at his baptism,[2] in this case they are opened much more gloriously to pour their light upon the earth. Elijah and Moses represent, as we have seen,[3] not only the most sublime, but also the most undying and eternal realities of the Old Testament: the Messiah now appears not simply ranked with them, but they owe their appearance on the earth to his transfiguration, and, moreover, they appear only that the message to the earth, as the final and eternal word from heaven, may not be simply as at the baptism, 'this is my beloved son!' but also 'hear ye him!' Upon this elevation of the Messianic history all this is no more too exalted; we behold at one glance the entire extent of this development from that first moment of the baptism onwards, and we behold here at the same time, as in a prelude, the eternal transfiguration beginning, scarcely at all retarded by the few things that have yet to be completed on the earth. Thus in this case also the sublimest realities seek the forms that render them apprehensible, the most unutterable things seek expression in words: and everything of a lower nature that could give occasion to this reminiscence and these forms is here lost in the purest and brightest light of the skies. Moreover, the narrative incontestably belongs to the oldest stratum of Gospel narration.[4] But if we, after two thousand years, should also with Peter indulge a desire to build tabernacles here, for us also the whole epiphany of glory would immediately vanish again, and nothing would remain from it but the warning, 'unto him must ye hearken!'[5] And, moreover, it is in fact expressly said here, that not until *after* the resurrection did the three speak

[1] Which therefore, according to the above connection of events, is not meant to be the Tabor (as was subsequently generally supposed), but one of the high mountains by the sources of the Jordan.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 149 sq.

[3] Pp. 123 sq.

[4] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 59 sq.

[5] These words from Deut. xviii. 15.

of this moment of heavenly light.[1] But even the early appendix to this narration shows how easy it could become to the inspired gaze to behold the return of an Elijah into the world. For when the three, the narrative proceeds, questioned Jesus regarding the tradition of the Elijah [2] who was to precede the Messiah, he let this idea pass in its inner truth, but explained that if the Messiah must, according to the Scriptures, suffer many things and die, and this was now soon to take place, so his forerunner must in fact have come already similarly suffering, that is, the Baptist, whom on another occasion he spoke of as being comparable with Elijah.[3] Thus certainly were all the ancient ideas and hopes, under the wholly new and creative fervour of Christian experiences and intuitions, melted down afresh into a new mould, and thus made to assume new forms. And then the case itself teaches that all such celestial words, though they are from the Old Testament, are still such as now resounded in the world with a divine power and truth which they had never possessed before, and the new truth of which had surely necessarily thus to be impressed on this new age at first with overwhelming force.

Nevertheless, it was here shown by a very fully related example, how far the Twelve, particularly when the three favoured ones were absent, still remained, at all events in more difficult positions, short of what they ought to be. When he returned to them, he beheld them surrounded by many people and engaged in a violent dispute with the Scribes; his appearance on the scene (as if he had been absent unexpectedly long) at once created a general movement, and the people hastened to salute him. Upon his inquiry for the cause of such a violent dispute, some one declared to him that he had brought his deaf and dumb son, who was afflicted with the demon of epilepsy, to the disciples to be cured, but they were unable to cure him: it may easily be supposed how the Scribes would then attack the disciples, and that the latter could with difficulty make any defence. Thereupon Jesus was seized with deep pain, not so much at the disciples as at the unbelieving and perverse generation generally, from the perverse education of which however they suffered more than might fairly have been expected. The treatment of the case, which he himself at once begins, convinces him indeed of its uncommon difficulty, and on further inquiry he learns from the father that

[1] This detail, Mark ix. 9, 10, Matt. xvii. 9, belongs undoubtedly to the original narration, although Luke ix. 36 has scarcely given sufficient prominence to it.

[2] See *ante*, p. 128.

[3] *Ante*, p. 330.

his son suffered from his earliest childhood from this affliction: but seized with compassion for the father, who eagerly declares the true faith in his healing power, he proceeds to the work of healing while he is still uninterrupted by the continually growing multitude of the people, and after considerable labour the cure is effected. But to the disciples, who subsequently in the house question him as to the cause of their inability, he gives the explanation that they are still wanting in the full magic power of perfect faith, and how that kind of men can succeed in nothing really difficult, men of a kind who always set to work merely (as, for instance, the Pharisees do) with prayer and fasting, and suppose that they possess therein all the divine means of strengthening the spirit.[1] As applied to the present case, there was conveyed in this explanation simply the reproach, that they had too soon relaxed their believing zeal in healing labours, misled by their own tendency to doubt, and the perversity of the opposing Scribes; that fasting and prayer were not to be regarded, as the schools of the time taught, as always adequate means of strengthening the spirit in difficult labours.

4. Thus then, the last days and weeks that he could still spend in the north arrived. He travelled with the Twelve at that time much through Galilee in the proper sense, desiring to remain unknown as much as possible; and his chief concern was to familiarise the Twelve more and more with the thought of his approaching end.[2]

Especially he made during these remaining weeks another visit to Capernaum, as if he found it most difficult to separate himself from that place particularly where he had once longest displayed his higher activity. It was there also where, according to the Collected Sayings, he yet seized in these remaining days every opportunity of showing, by both his own example and his word of instruction, how the members of the Community of perfect religion must act as regards questions about government, rank, and honour; the Collected Sayings, at all events, use precisely this place for the purpose of putting together all his

[1] The end of this his explanation is undoubtedly preserved in a much more original, complete, and plain form in Matt. xvii. 20, 21; in our present Mark ix. 28, 29, on the contrary, from the ambiguity of the brief words, manifestly by a slight change, the meaning is put upon them, 'this kind (of *demon*) can be expelled by nothing else than prayer.' And thus, it must be allowed, Luke already understood these words, since although he omits them entirely he still, ix. 42, interweaves prayer as specially important in his representation of the method of healing; just as Luke generally attaches great weight to the prayers of Jesus. [In his *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 341, the author says as regards Luke ix. 42, Luke 'understood ver. 42, after the analogy of Mark i. 25, iii. 12, as if Jesus had healed the child *by rebuking* the unclean spirit (which, it may be supposed, was preceded by prayer to God.)']

[2] Mark ix. 30, 31.

wonderfully profound utterances regarding such complicated circumstances of human life.[1] And undoubtedly he spoke about these questions most often and most distinctly in the somewhat later portion of this general period, just as he still continued everywhere until the very end of his life to illustrate particularly the higher duties of life which were required from his disciples. For the Community had first to be firmly founded and to have been some time in existence, before these duties of higher love could be successfully taught in it; but now, after he had himself, in the midst of his disciples, everywhere shown the power of higher love as inseparable from that of the truth, it was easy to teach this more difficult lesson also by means of plain examples.

We will here expound only one example, not easy to be understood, which he spontaneously gave from his own and his disciples' relation to the existing government.[2] When with the Twelve he again visited Capernaum after a considerable absence, and had himself entered somewhat before them into the house which still continued open to him here, the collectors of the annual temple-tax,[3] who had probably long vainly waited for the arrival of the Master of these Twelve, who was all along properly a citizen of Capernaum, met on the way Peter and asked him, as the acknowledged *primus* of his disciples, whether their Master did not pay the two drachmas. It might be supposed that, as the Messiah, which he was already considered by many to be, and the opponent of the Scribes and the existing Hagiocracy, which he could be deemed to be, he probably did not intend to pay the tax; and the precedent of the Master would in that case be binding on his disciples. Peter answered the question in the affirmative, indeed, but nevertheless had first to seek the decision of the Master himself. But as soon as he entered the house, Christ anticipated him with the question whether, in his opinion, the state-taxes would be paid by the relatives of the king or by strangers? Inasmuch as the taxes serve for sustaining the order of the state, falling accordingly into the hands of those who preserve this order, that is, of the king and his immediate servants, it follows that they who exist simply that they may govern and must obtain their livelihood in governing, need not themselves pay taxes;[4] thus in

[1] See the details in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 342 sq.

[2] Matt. xvii. 24–27.

[3] See *ante*, p. 42.

[4] If this rule has now been generally altered, we must remember that state officials now draw salaries instead, and generally very large ones; so that they can easily pay back a portion of it. Comp. *Conseils de Nabi Efendi* (Paris, 1857) pp. 86 sq.

Israel the Levites paid no taxes, because, as standing nearest to Jahveh, their office was, according to the primitive constitution of the nation, to maintain law and order in the state; and the Romans paid none when they had become the masters of all other nations and had taken upon themselves the cares of government for them. Accordingly, Christ also, as the head of the true kingdom of God and of the new Israel into which the former Israel had passed, might be free from taxes, and they also who were nearest to him, and would have no need to concern themselves any more about the old system of things. But, to give no cause of stumbling, he nevertheless prefers from pure love to pay with his disciples the taxes, and to respect the existing government so far as it demands obedience only in such temporal things. And how easy is it really to obtain such worldly wealth so far as it is needed to pay, for instance, the demands of the tax-collector! In the mouth of the first fish which Peter takes when he throws out his hook at the command of the Lord, he shall find a stater (that is, as equivalent to four drachmas,[1] sufficient to pay the tax for both!) It is not also narrated that this was done by Peter, and the tax paid in this way; the phrase is based upon well-known, though very uncommon, examples of such 'finds' in fishes; but it is often mentioned in the Gospels[2] how the blessing of the higher religion rests also upon all temporal gains. Thus, therefore, did Jesus regard the relation of himself and of his disciples to the temporal government.[3]

b. *The autumn stay in Jerusalem.*

More and more restless, however, as the foot of Jesus now became, and much as he travelled about in the north with the Twelve, he had no desire after his last visit to Jerusalem at the feast,[4] and the subsequent founding of his Community, to make his way thither again. The Easter of this year had passed without his appearance there; and the autumn feast was now approaching without presenting any signs of preparation for a journey thither. Why should he, without necessity, and before the time, revisit a place which he had found by experience in the past, and was still finding, was the seat of all possible hostility against him? He had constantly, in the training of the Twelve and the most undisturbed prosecution possible of his

[1] See *ante*, p. 42.
[2] *Ante*, p. 277.
[3] The same meaning is conveyed also by the narrative Matt. xxii. 15–22.
[4] See *ante*, pp. 281 sq.

other daily labours, infinitely more important duties to discharge than to contend with the heads and supporters of the Hagiocracy and further lay bare their defects.

However, it could not be his intention to avoid for ever the centre of all the true religion of the time and of its rule; and this was evidently never his intention. On the contrary, if his life-work, as he cherished it in his spirit and daily prosecuted it further in the world, could issue victoriously for that time and that nation without a fatal movement and catastrophe (and the possibility of this he might never wholly overlook, still less reject when he consulted his human wishes), it must gain its victories first in this centre. And in any case he must possess sufficient strength and courage to submit this work, when it had arrived nearer its completion, as far as it could at this stage be completed, once more quite freely and openly in this conspicuous centre itself to the candid judgment of the chief people of the time, that it might be seen whether they would adopt it or not. He must himself once more appear openly before them just as he was, and taught and laboured, to ascertain whether they would permit him in the future to be and teach and labour as hitherto, and accordingly whether they would deliberately put any obstacles in the way of the progress of the perfected true religion or not.

Accordingly, when the autumn feast of that year approached, and (as we must suppose) he was just then in Capernaum, his brothers, who resided there, and were still regarding his teaching with indifference and suspicion, though having no decided hostility to himself, proposed to him the question, why he did not, if he possessed Messianic powers and could do Messianic works, show them quite openly in Judea; alleging that Galilee, in which alone for a year past he had worked, was, as compared with Judea and Jerusalem, a country in which a man could act only as in darkness; and that Jerusalem alone was the great conspicuous world in which he must reveal himself. To such words of his own brothers, reported by John with remarkable faithfulness,[1] he made no further reply than 'that his time had not yet come,' 'that he must consider many things and endure a hatred of which they knew nothing; they might go up to the feast, he would not go now.' So they went without him. However, he had thereby only refused to make the journey with them in the usual manner, that is, in the great general train of pilgrims from Galilee, in order that before the feast they might

[1] John vii. 2–5.

enter the sacred city in a festal procession. If he had gone in that way he would have been at once recognised there, and would have provoked, as if deliberately, the attention of the rulers, which he now greatly desired to avoid; for he still felt that his life-work must not be cut short by his own precipitancy, and he had still reason to seize eagerly every hour in which he could devote himself further to the Twelve and to more sufferers. There was, however, in this case an alternative possibility. He could make the journey a few days later; he would then avoid the public festal entrance, and could still, as the feast lasted seven days and had also an eighth as a great closing day, be in time to mingle in the great concourse of people and learn fully how the men of Jerusalem in the presence of such crowds of people were disposed towards him and his work. Indeed, this course must have now seemed to him to present even many advantages, apart from the unnecessary exposure to greater danger which the first course would have involved. For it was far more considerate and merciful at first to appear once more in this great centre, where undoubtedly his cause must be finally decided, without any noise, retiringly and calmly, though without veiling the truth, so that more leisure might be obtained for the complete presentation of his cause, and everything might be tried that could be done on his part in profound humility, self-denial, and calmness. Indeed, it may be said it was for him a higher duty of love not to render the interruption of his work too easy to his enemies, and while exhibiting all the sincerity and boldness which his work demanded, nevertheless to keep out of their way as long as possible.

Accordingly he did not go to Jerusalem until the festal week had begun, and then 'as in secret,' avoiding intentionally all public demonstration,[1] although attended by his most intimate disciples.[2] His enemies had already vainly looked for him, whilst amongst the people generally the opinion regarding him, which was always expressed at the feasts, was divided, and

[1] The best illustration of this is supplied by the opposite manner in which he entered at the last Easter feast; see below.

[2] After John has mentioned the Twelve so often and so emphatically in ch. vi., it creates some surprise that he does not refer to them at all, ch. vii. and viii., and ix. 2 only mentions the disciples indefinitely; it might therefore be conjectured that Jesus on that occasion took with him the Three only, giving the others commissions in Galilee. However, John mentions the number 'Twelve' nowhere else than ch. vi., and there evidently only to indicate thereby the time in which those occurrences happened: from the language of this Gospel alone therefore nothing can be positively inferred on this point, although from the other circumstances certainly it is even probable that he now went to Jerusalem with the Three only.

was likewise considerably repressed from fear of the smaller excommunication with which the Hagiocracy had already threatened his adherents. Nevertheless, he appeared, just in the middle of the festal week, in the precincts of the Temple[1] in order to teach, and remained now even longer than usual in the capital, avoiding any great commotion as well as the snares of his enemies. Indeed, according to the accounts before us, we must suppose that he stayed there even till after the feast of the Dedication of the Temple in December,[2] if not always dwelling in the capital itself, yet in its neighbourhood and otherwise in Judea.[3]

Within this quarter of a year he had therefore time and opportunity enough for making himself perfectly acquainted in all directions with the lasting feeling towards him and his work, both of the people generally and particularly of their ecclesiastical rulers, and, with his self-restraint and caution, sufficient time and opportunity too to show them who he was when at the full height of his teaching and of his labours. And undoubtedly this quiet and yet completely unmistakable manifestation, at the centre of the Hagiocracy, of his entire position during the full noon of his public labours was necessarily so much a part of the duties of his Messianic office (so to speak) that it would have been a serious loss if it had been actually omitted. Only thus could and must it at last be decided whether his work should become victorious on the earth or not. For here in Jerusalem were all the treasures of knowledge and all the inducements and means of action still more closely collected together than anywhere else; and that the final decision should thus quietly proceed from the inmost necessity of the case, and without even the slightest use of violence on his part in the form of a surprise and challenge, was not a small advantage attaching to his good cause itself;

[1] Particular localities in the Temple mentioned are, John viii. 20, the 'treasury,' according to Mark xii. 41, 42, a house in the outer court on the east, not far from the entrance, built for the reception of gifts of money by visitors to the Temple, the open space in the front of which house is here really meant; and John x. 23 'Solomon's Porch,' a covered colonnade, where he stayed (as John indicates) on account of the rainy weather in December. It appears plainly enough from Acts iii. 11 (v. 12) compared with iii. 2, 10, comp. vol. v. p. 434, that this Porch was on the east side of the Temple; according to Josephus also, *Ant.* xx. 9. 7, it was situated on the east side, but probably derived its name 'Solomon's Porch,' which is now found in the New Testament only, not from its having actually been built by Solomon, as was then certainly often said, as we see from Josephus, but because teachers of wisdom after the ancient Solomonian manner, could there freely appear and gather hearers around them.

[2] John x. 22, comp. vol. v. p. 312.

[3] It is true that this is not expressly said, John vii. 14—x. 39, but it is in itself probable and is really implied in the fact that John vii. 3 it is not Jerusalem but Judea generally which is spoken of as the district where his disciples would likewise gladly behold his works.

so that we must in this as in everything else greatly admire that perfectly clear and purely exalted perception which led him to act in Jerusalem in the way he now acted. We must therefore be very grateful to John also that he has in his Gospel described these circumstances much more definitely as regards time and place than had been done in the earlier books. According to the earlier Gospel narrative also, the final crisis did not follow until after a serious general contention that had commenced in the Temple with all the parties then in power;[1] but according to this peculiar form of the narrative only a few of the most prominent points of this contention are brought together, and the contention again is compressed into the last days of the last festal journey; indeed, this entire distinction between a journey in the autumn preparatory for the end and a last journey at Easter is not found in the earlier narratives. But we must defer speaking of the particular circumstances of this last journey to Jerusalem for a later opportunity.

When accordingly John describes the events of the last stay but one in Jerusalem, he mentions, it is true, according to his characteristic manner, and in the freer reproduction to which he is accustomed, a number of various details which he was able somewhat more particularly to recall, yet really only such as most directly concerned the great question precisely of this period of Christ's public life and labours. Will Jesus, now at last in Jerusalem itself, on that bright elevation in the light of which he now shines in the world and with the full decisiveness of the language which he now uses notwithstanding his reserve, be acknowledged by the rulers or even by the people generally as he ought to have been acknowledged and received? That is the great question of this stage of the development of the whole history. How much was there in Jerusalem that must speak for him! And although the feeling of the rulers, with the exception of a very few,[2] had already too decidedly turned against him, the common people were more free from prejudice, and might, as less bound by merely scholastic notions, after all decide in his favour. But how now the people generally, after a long swaying hither and thither in the contention of the most various observations and conjectures, were nevertheless at last carried away no less than the rulers to take part in the general rejection, and, indeed, the fatal persecution of Christ—that is

[1] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 389–400.

[2] Nicodemus, before mentioned p. 260, is alone named John vii. 50–52; but on this point comp. below.

in this Gospel most vividly described; and the most instructive thing in this piece is that in this description all the various considerations upon which rests this long and excited contention, the tolerably peaceful conduct of which was due to Christ alone, are presented with such great truthfulness although only in the briefest outlines. And since in this way all the details are here narrated only in so far as they are of sufficient importance to vividly illustrate the great final result which the history of this whole quarter of a year had taught, the entire piece[1] takes the form of the transaction of one single matter, which transaction having been once commenced further unfolds itself with perpetual variations in innumerable vicissitudes of speech and act throughout all those days, until at last it reaches its final conclusion. We will at all events now briefly state the course of this transaction, since it really appears from it most plainly why the cause could not then triumph even amongst the people generally as they then were, and since we can nowhere else so plainly glance into the centre of the confusion of this contention regarding the significance of Jesus, which must have been both before and after his death so keenly carried on amongst the Judeans.

As he appeared in the precincts of the Temple to teach, his scholastic enemies object generally, that he is not a trained scholar[2] worthy of being listened to: this is a preliminary objection which is not without its weight with the unlearned masses. But he shows that in this case the essential matter is something quite other than the learning of the schools, that it is the doing of the divine will—in other words, the perfect true religion which is equally necessary for all men, the same religion which he proclaims, and for the sake of which they seek to destroy him.[3] When the multitude pronounces the latter charge impossible, and interprets it as an exaggeration of his imagination, he shows how unjustly the Scribes condemned him for a work of healing on the Sabbath when he was in Jerusalem on a former occasion,[4] and not without the participation of the people generally in the injustice: therefore he must regard the people as undoubtedly in danger of treating him with even the greatest injustice possible.[5] To this no proper reply can be made to him

[1] From John vii. 14 to x. 39. It follows from the meaning and connection of the whole piece, that the smaller piece on the adulteress vii. 58–viii. 11 cannot have its orignal place here; comp. below.

[2] See *ante*, p. 189.

[3] John vii. 16–19.

[4] See *ante*, p. 283.

[5] John vii. 20–24: the entire emphasis and meaning of this reply must therefore be sought in the πάντες, ver. 21; but it must be allowed that in the statement of John, which is so brief and compressed throughout, the word *one work*, ver. 21, is

by any party; so the mind of the people already inclines in his favour, particularly as they must suppose that the chief men, inasmuch as they are silent, may perhaps have already acknowledged him as the Christ: only that he is of such an unknown origin, still staggers them: to meet which he shows how little in this case earthly origin can signify.[1] But since he thereby refers to his celestial origin, to seek to assert which, as we have seen,[2] had long appeared to these chief men blasphemy, they desire at once to arrest him; the masses of the people, however, are the more attracted to the wonder-worker, and the chief men do not as yet venture to take him. On account of this even favourable feeling of the people the chief persons therefore now simply send out men to waylay him, who are to arrest him when the opportunity offers by a return of the popular feeling against him: but, on the other hand, his last public utterance on that day, that he will soon enough depart, sounds like unintended bitter disdain; yet that also is interpreted in a false and low sense, as if he had intimated that he would go to the heathen, whom therefore they really fear secretly more than they would like to acknowledge![3]

On the eighth, as the great closing day of the autumn feast,[4] he spoke with unusual emotion to the assembled people concerning genuine faith. In this case the Apostle proceeds in his reproduction of the words of Christ from the two fundamental ideas which can most completely express the true conception of the Messiah, and concerning which at the same time the perverse judgments of men must be most exercised, inasmuch

left almost too concise, inasmuch as it is intended to refer back to what was narrated in ch. v.; yet it is explained sufficiently, vv. 22, 23, at all events for the attentive reader, and what Christ says here regarding the observance of the Sabbath, fully accords with what he teaches Mark iii. 4, Luke xiii. 15, 16, xiv. 5, only that in John it is more profoundly proved. Comp. as regards another point connected with the word *one work*, my *Joh. Schriften*, i. p. 221.

[1] vii. 25–29. The idea, ver. 27, that when the Messiah came no one would know whence he was, could not have arisen until after the *celestialising* of the Messianic hope above described (pp. 107 sq.): but nothing evidently had such an influence upon this celestialisation as the descriptions of the Messiah and his mysteries in the Book of Enoch.

[2] Pp. 283 sq.

[3] vii. 30–36. As according to pp. 82 sq. many Judeans at that time went amongst the heathen as teachers of the Law and preachers of their religion, and were often very successful amongst them, and also many heathen visited famous teachers of the Law even in Jerusalem itself (comp. x. 16, xi. 52, and the remarks on John xii. 20 sq. below), such a supposition easily presented itself.

[4] That this day is meant John vii. 37, admits of no doubt when the arrangements of the feast are properly recognised, see *Antiquities*. p. 364: the figure of drinking alludes evidently to the later custom of water-libations on the seven days of the autumn feast, as it is not a repetition, as in the corresponding case, viii. 12, of a figure previously used in this Gospel. Inasmuch as at the autumn feast the rain had been longest absent and water had become scarce, it was then that it was most strongly longed for; comp. *M.* ראש השנה i. 2, and *Antiquities*, pp. 351 sq.

as at this time the thing that is more and more essential is the right conception of him. These two fundamental ideas are those of *life* and *light*, only that in this particular case (as the Apostle undoubtedly still remembered) Christ spoke rather of the water of life instead of life generally, as led by the special circumstances of the moment. In consequence many were very much moved, and inclined to regard him as the prophet-forerunner of the Messiah, or as the Messiah himself, whilst others doubted the latter, inasmuch as he was not from Bethlehem, nor of the seed of David; others also were disposed to arrest him. But they hesitated to do the latter, prevented simply by the force of his words; so that the officers returned to their chiefs empty-handed, of whom only a very few dared to urge the injustice which was thus about to be committed.[1] Moreover, when he then proceeded to speak, from the starting point of the true conception of the light, concerning the proper faith in relation to his appearing, though the Pharisees, involved in the meshes of their low earthly thoughts, raised their perpetual objections, they still vainly sought to produce an effect upon the people by them.[2] Indeed, when on another day, an ordinary Sabbath, he exhorted the people, with reference to his early removal, in spite of the almost intentionally continued misunderstandings on the part of his enemies, to have the right faith, he found on that occasion also many who were ready truly to believe.[3] But when he now spoke directly to those who were ready to believe of the higher duties and consequences of true faith, and sought to convince them that nothing but the truth, which had to be gained by faith, could secure for them also the freedom they desired, their national pride was roused, and step by step the more fiercely as he went on more definitely to substantiate his declaration, so that they would probably have stoned him if he had not, by anticipating the full outburst of their indignation, silently departed from the Temple.[4]

But on the same day he still healed by his accustomed method a man that had been born blind: when this got rumoured abroad, the Pharisees, as they were unwillingly com-

[1] vii. 37–52.

[2] viii. 12–20; according to ver. 20 that day was therewith ended, and it is thus confirmed in every way that the words vii. 27—viii. 20, originally formed a great discussion which falls into two halves, to which was subsequently added the passage vii. 53—viii. 11 from another Gospel. The words vii. 38 are from an Apocrypha which we have not hitherto been able to trace; and the words viii. 56 presuppose a narrative similar to that of Mark ix. 2–8.

[3] viii. 21–30, comp. ix. 14.

[4] viii. 31–59: here also the details of the description of the fast-approaching end of the conflict are very admirably drawn.

pelled to admit the truth of the deed, sought to get the man who had done this benevolent act to the poor sufferer denounced as a sinner in a very special degree, because he had effected the cure on the Sabbath. On this account they persecuted both the cured sufferer and his parents, suspended over him the smaller excommunication when he repudiated on good grounds their demand that he should regard his benefactor as a sinner, and were unable either to prevent the man that had been blind becoming increasingly strong in his faith,[1] or themselves being more and more plainly and openly described by Jesus (as they deserved) as the truly blind leaders of the people, unwilling as they might be to hear that, and however much many of the people also took offence at this.[2] Thus there appears nevertheless once more some inclination towards him amongst the people. But when he at last appeared at the feast of the Dedication of the Temple in a somewhat largely attended gathering of the people, it was soon shown that they would really turn against him. As on their vehemently urging him, if he were really the Messiah, at length openly to declare himself, and accordingly place himself at their head as an earthly king, he makes no other reply than that they required only first the true faith to perceive that with him is the true eternal life and salvation, and that he and his work and word are inseparable from God, then their indignation at his supposed presumption towards God breaks out again, and can be so little appeased any more by the truest representations of the fact, that he must hasten to escape from its full outburst.[3]

Accordingly, by this long-suffering and patient stay of some time in Jerusalem it had been decided that the masses of the people also, notwithstanding their pitiable state and in spite of the sparks of better, still uncorrupted, spirit which were in certain moments emitted so as to abash their more hardened ecclesiastical superiors, were still incapable of really seizing the true salvation when it was at last brought near to them, because in the end, though in other respects openness of mind

[1] ix. 1–38: we must therefore bear in mind, according to ix. 14, that the former part of this great transaction also from viii. 21 onwards took place on a Sabbath, comp. viii. 59.

[2] ix. 39—x. 21: a passage which in John's manner simply expounds the same thing that is presented in another way in the Collected Sayings according to Matt. ch. xxiii.

[3] x. 22–39; in the exposition vv. 25–30, it is well to note that Christ, even in this connection, points not only to the true faith but also to the eternal life, ver. 28: for the doubt with the question *whether* is the more perverse inasmuch as by it, and therefore by the absence of faith, even this eternal life is lost, which is after all the highest and only lasting good. In conclusion, it appears from all the above considerations how properly this entire, extremely complicated transaction, John vii. 14—x. 39, falls into the three great sections above adopted.

was not wholly wanting to them, yet some inveterate prejudices of various kinds blinded their eyes and rendered them pitiable instruments in the hands of their blind leaders. When this attempt also had proved itself to be in vain, Christ may already have lamented in the words in which, according to the earliest Gospel document, he lamented towards the end of his life, that he had often vainly sought to gather the children of Jerusalem, as a hen her chickens under her wings; but that they had themselves refused to be thus saved by him.[1]

We know nothing certain of other events during this stay in Jerusalem and Judea. But it is possible that to this time, when Jesus was staying so long in the capital, and was tormented by the men of the schools with all possible temptations, belongs that story of the woman taken in adultery which was somewhat early inserted in the Gospel of John at this point, as seeming appropriate.[2] In this story it is supposed that he had his dwelling at night on the Mount of Olives. When he went again one morning into the court of the Temple and sat down to teach, 'the Scribes and Pharisees' brought to him an adulteress, taken in the act, in order to ask him whether he advised that the penalty of stoning, attached by the sacred Law to such a sin, should really be inflicted upon her. Undoubtedly the leniency of his judgment regarding such sinners belonging to the lower class had long been known, whilst the Hagiocratic rulers were in the habit of condemning the sinners of this class most severely, and hypocritically avoided in their own case rather the appearance and the scandal than the reality of the related sins: they expected therefore that he would rather excuse and acquit than condemn the woman.[3] But he did as if he had not heard their question, stooped down and wrote with his finger on the ground, apparently occupied alone with his own thoughts, while really he undoubtedly then began to write down what he subsequently

[1] Matt. xxiii. 37–39, Luke xiii. 41, 42, comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 406: it is at all events conceivable that the lamentation was delivered at that time; as generally it is remarkable that John after x. 39 reports scarcely any longer speech of Jesus against Jerusalem and his enemies.

[2] John vii. 53–viii. 11; the Evangelical book from which the piece was probably taken has been described in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 90. The Armenian Church did not possess the piece at all, or at all events only appended to the Gospel of John: see *Journ. Asiat.* 1867, p. 168.

[3] This simple supposition in this case suffices; as generally much that is foreign to it has been in early and recent times introduced into this very simple narrative. It has also been quite gratuitously supposed in recent times, that stoning was required by the Law in the case of a simply affianced bride, and that this woman was such: see *Antiquities*, pp. 190–201. It is quite sufficient to suppose that she was an adulteress belonging to the common people.—A story very similar to that of the adulteress, but really perhaps rather formed in imitation of it, see in the *Berliner Akad. Monatsberichten*, 1860, pp. 71 sq.

uttered aloud, and thus sought at the same time to make those present, who had so greatly forgotten themselves, silent and attentive. But as they nevertheless would not cease to question him, he looked up and demanded of them, that he amongst them who was conscious of his innocence should cast the first stone at her; then he stooped down again and was absorbed in writing once more. And notwithstanding the solemnity with which the deputation, as from the Sanhedrîn, with the elders at its head, had come to him, not less unceremoniously did they, smitten by their bad consciences, leave him with the elders at their head; and after they had all gone forth to the very last man, he dismissed the woman also with the serious exhortation not to sin again.—It is true that this story belongs in its present form to the later stratum of narrative, and it is hardly possible to say how much of it in detail may be historical: yet in its ultimate meaning it accords quite well with the others which explain the relation of Jesus, and that of the no less proud than hypocritical Hagiocratic rulers of that time, to the sinners of the lower orders of the people.

c. *The stay by the Jordan, on both sides of it. The resolution of the Sanhedrîn as to Christ.*

When Jesus resolved, as above explained, to get away from Jerusalem, he took his way to Bethany,[1] on the other side Jordan, northwards, the same place where he had once, as we have seen,[2] experienced those first moments when he received from the Baptist his Messianic call. The selection of this locality precisely at this juncture is no less significant, just as it is no less intelligible, than that in Galilee he visited, as we have seen,[3] Capernaum last of all. He foresaw how soon the work of his days on earth must now come to an end: and where could he more suitably prepare himself for this end than at that place where everything reminded him of the first sacred moments of his public work? For its end must be no less divinely pure and great than its beginning. Many, too, at this place, where the Baptist had laboured so long, received him believingly, finding that everything that the Baptist had expected and foretold of him had been really fulfilled in him, as far, that is, of course, as it could at that time be fulfilled.

Probably he had not spent many weeks here when he received a very mournful message from a family with which he was very intimate, living at the other Bethany, which was

[1] John x. 40–42. [2] P. 198. [3] P. 355.

situated not far from Jerusalem, on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives. This was the well-to-do family of Lazarus, in which he had often enjoyed the hospitality of friends on his earlier journeys. The two sisters of his host, Mary and Martha, also gladly listened to his words, and in no house did he probably find himself more at home than theirs. Martha was probably the younger sister and Mary was properly the mistress of the house;[1] Lazarus was most likely younger than either of the sisters; the father Simon, with the surname 'the Leper,' appears to have then been dead, but to have been still alive at the time of the earlier public labours of Jesus.[2] From an earlier time an incident was narrated which occurred on a visit of the Master's to this house. The two sisters then gave themselves much trouble to receive him suitably, but each in a very different way, Martha waiting upon him and being wholly unable to do enough in such services of love, Mary silently listening to the Master's words and being quite as little able to do enough in that way. When accordingly the former, unwearied in presenting all possible external necessaries which she supposed could be acceptable to Jesus, came to him with the request that he would order her sister to help in such ministries, in his kind displeasure he rebuked her excessive care about such things, and added, that one thing only was needful for every man—care for higher divine things, and that that was the inalienable good portion which Mary had chosen for herself.[3]

The sisters and brother had probably been led to higher faith when Christ in earlier times had much intercourse with their father, who had since died, and when he, whether agreeing or doubting, talked much with them about the new 'Master.' At the time before us the sisters sent the message to him, that his friend Lazarus was dangerously ill: and as they sent this message a great distance, they desired manifestly that he should go to his assistance.

[1] From the words John xi. 1, 31, 45, this appears most probable.

[2] That is, it can hardly be without good reason that in the earlier narrative Mark xiv. 3, Matt. xxvi. 6, the 'house of Simon' is found where John xii. 1 Lazarus's house is named: inasmuch as the two kinds of narrative agree in the fact that on his last journey to Jerusalem Christ stayed precisely in Bethany in this house, and that event (see below) was in other respects so memorable in the reminiscences of this last journey to Jerusalem. It admits of no doubt that this Simon, with the surname of 'the Leper,' was a well-to-do-man, just as the house of Lazarus appears to be in John; and in the later narrative Luke vii. 36–50, in which also he is undoubtedly intended, he appears in similarly comfortable circumstances, only that in this case he is represented as a Pharisee. With regard to this later narrative, see below; at all events it appears from it that the resort of Jesus to this house was always much spoken of; and we know in fact from other sources, that before the last journey he stayed a good deal in this village, and in this very house.

[3] Luke x. 38–42, comp. John xii. 2.

It is certain also that Jesus did not lack the strong desire to be of service to his dear friend; but he had to consider that any return into the neighbourhood of Jerusalem might be immediately fatal, as the Twelve also knew and undoubtedly used every means to keep him from such a resolution, particularly from going thither again so soon.[1] Nevertheless he overcame this consideration, and still saved the friend who was already lost: this John relates, and nothing can be more historical than this occurrence, the only more important one that he mentions belonging to this last brief period before the journey to the Easter feast. For it is of no great importance that the earlier narrative leaves it unmentioned: in fact it does not generally distinguish with any particularity the periods and the occurrences of this last time between his departure from Galilee and the last festal march to Jerusalem, whilst John supplies this defect in the narrative most definitely, and moreover, like everything else that he relates, this particular event fits most perfectly into the proper course of the general development of this history, as we have already incidentally remarked.[2] But it must be allowed as perfectly evident that John narrates this occurrence in the most vivid manner with very special interest, and in such a way that he takes as the basis of it the same general view of Christ's earthly existence and work which forms precisely the characteristic spirit and motive of his whole Gospel; neither can we fail to see in this narrative a certain artistic element that corresponds to the general plan of the Gospel. That is, it is observable that John throughout his entire Gospel narrates only one example of each of the chief kinds of the 'works' of Christ, though an adequate and sufficiently plain example:[3] thus this is the solitary example of the raising of the dead that he supplies, whilst it is not at all surprising that the earlier Gospels do not amongst the numerous instances of raising the dead of which they speak generally[4] refer to this one in particular. But as John everywhere delights to represent Christ as the true life and light, an instance of his

[1] Comp. John xi. 8.

[2] P. 335.

[3] A transmutation John ii. 1–10; a cure of a fever iv. 47–54; a cure of a lame man v. 1–9; a feeding of multitudes vi. 4–13; a walking on the stormy sea vi. 16–21; a healing of a blind man ix. 1–7; a raising of the dead ch. xi. This cannot be mere accident. Elsewhere also it appears that John refers to all the various great events of the Gospel history simply in his own manner. But neither does the number seven appear here quite accidentally, though not selected with any very decided purpose: comp. *Jahrbb. d. B.W.* viii. pp. 109 sq.

[4] Even in the Collected Sayings Matt. xi. 5. This argument also, on the ground of which many in our day seek persistently to deny the historical character of the narrative in John, is therefore as futile as the rest.

power to raise the dead appears to him pre-eminently to illustrate this great truth, inasmuch as that eternal life is surely intended to make itself felt also in the midst of this earthly life. And inasmuch as the earthly term of the shining of this peerless light amid the darkness of the earth must now soon have an end, it appeared to him evidently worth the trouble to show that in this last unusual deed [1] the same miraculous power of divine life revealed itself as in all the earlier ones. Accordingly, in no other narrative of this Apostle's do we meet everywhere such a deep inner fire and bounding animation of thought and style, a narrative in which he endeavours to describe in one great picture the trembling of this Life for the life of its friend, its conflict with the darknesses of the world in this aspect also, and its confidence and victorious joy notwithstanding, transcending all the gloom, and from first to last undimmed. In the midst of this description the still higher notes of the consciousness of the Messianic glory and its mighty attestation make themselves heard.

As soon, therefore, as he hears of the sickness, he exclaims at once with the highest confidence, that it is certainly not designed to be unto death, but for the glory of God and the Messiah: but he still remains calmly in the same place two days longer. On the following day, as if suddenly a profound thought told him that his sick friend was really just then dying,[2] he summons (inasmuch as now not a moment can be lost) quickly the Twelve to start with him again for Judea, replies to their hesitation, that it is necessary to act while it is still day,[3] and then declares to them more definitely that Lazarus has fallen asleep. Inasmuch as they understand the latter expression as meaning ordinary sleep, and on that account continue to hesitate to depart with him, he explains to them at last (as if his own view became clearer by their objections) without any circumlocution that Lazarus is dead; nevertheless he rejoices to go with them to him in order that they may learn to believe in him, and least of all permits himself just at last

[1] As a fact there is no other 'work' further referred to in this Gospel subsequent to ch. xi.

[2] That is, it is quite plain, ver. 7, that according to the whole connection and meaning of the narrative, it is only an inward voice which tells him that Lazarus has just died; but, on the other hand, he cannot have died earlier, inasmuch as then there would be no reason for the sudden determination of Jesus to depart. The journey accordingly on this supposition occupied the second and third days fully, and an indefinite number of hours of the first and the fourth, if it was at once commenced on the first; on the fourth they could arrive pretty early. This is of importance as regards the question of the situation of Bethany by the northern Jordan, see *ante*, p. 198.

[3] That is, during the day of Christ which is already near its close; nothing else than this is the meaning of the words vv. 9, 10, comp. ix. 4, xii. 35.

to be kept from starting by the somewhat satirical unbelief of Thomas.[1] But when they now, having travelled along the eastern bank of the Jordan southwards, and then over the river, arrive on the fourth day from that moment at Bethany, they find him already in his grave, having been buried four days before, and many people gathered around the sisters to comfort them. But Martha, who having heard of his approach receives him outside the village, attains to full faith in his Messianic power and authority; still more easily Mary directly afterwards, who is fetched from the house by her sister and followed by the other mourners, who suppose that she hastens to the grave to make lamentation there. Then as he sees them all weeping the moment comes for him to act. And as if he must previously collect all the deepest forces of love and pity, repeatedly groaning and weeping in the profoundest emotion,[2] he enters upon the work; he orders the grave to be shown to him, approaches it in sight of the mourners, some of whom are inclined to be angry that he has not come earlier to save his friend;[3] then he causes the stone to be rolled away, whilst Martha supposes that the body must already smell; he looks upwards with prayer and thanksgiving to the Father, full of divine assurance of victory, and with a mighty voice calls forth the dead man who is still bound in his grave clothes; and thus he puts to shame particularly all the doubters of various kinds. And on reading this long, intensely emotional narrative, who does not feel radiating from its whole tone and form the boundless gladness of victory with which the first Christians looked forward to the death of the friends of Christ, and to meeting him himself as the great resuscitator who would appear again in due time? It was only the glance forwards into the great future also which could make the Apostle's recollection of that one incident of the past thrill with such higher joy, and thus glorify and transfigure his words. And the finest part of this narrative is not understood if this is overlooked or denied.[4]

[1] According to the proper force of the words ver. 16, Thomas only speaks in conformity with that spirit slow of belief which is elsewhere ascribed to him; he supposes that inasmuch as Lazarus is dead, they would really go to no purpose; perhaps, he adds almost bitterly, in order to die with him! No other meaning is implied either in the connection of the words or the narrative, nor by the nature of the spirit of Thomas.

[2] ἐμβριμᾶσθαι vv. 33, 38, is therefore according to the clear meaning of this narrative, as well as from the nature of the thing itself, only a somewhat stronger word than στενάζειν or ἀναστενάζειν, which is used by Mark to express the same emotional process, Mark vii. 34 comp. viii. 12.

[3] The words ver. 37 are intended to express this simply; as generally the Judeans mentioned ch. xi. are not at all hostilely disposed, inasmuch as they have not been sent from the Sanhedrîn.

[4] It appears from his own subsequent words, how great weight John attaches to

The return of Jesus to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and the resumption of his general line of work under their eyes, necessarily put the members of the Hagiocracy immediately into great commotion again. They had probably expected that he would not feel inclined to return to Jerusalem or its vicinity, and meanwhile be more and more deserted in the more remote provinces by his adherents who had been already put under the smaller excommunication. Having been thus early deceived in this by the event in their neighbourhood, which was witnessed by so many Judeans of position, they resolved to bring the matter before the Sanhedrîn, that they might be duly prepared for the future. We do not now know what Pharisees and other members of the Hagiocracy were the first and most active enemies of Jesus: inasmuch as his cause gradually made its way upwards from the ranks of the people, it may have been a considerable time before the reigning high priest Caiaphas[1] took any special notice of it. But if these enemies determined to remain no longer satisfied with less severe measures against him and his adherents, but to induce the Sanhedrîn, under the presidency of the high priest, to adopt such as would lead to his complete destruction, they had first of all to find an adequate pretext for such action; and such a pretext was not so very difficult to invent.

The most profound cause of the antagonism it is true lay, as we have seen, solely in the fact that, on the one hand, in Jesus the perfect true religion in all its immovable certainty and unsurpassable lucidity already confronted the Hagiocracy in full operation in the world, while, on the other hand, there existed no true inclination, and indeed not so much as a proper preparation, for the reception of this religion on the part of the great majority of those who, on the contrary, had suffered the true religion, which they supposed they palpably possessed and defended, to become stiff and dead, and, just when it most absolutely needed its own consummation, did not comprehend the sole way by which this could properly come. If this perfected true religion had come to them in an outwardly splendid form—for instance, in that of a great conqueror and vanquisher of the Romans—they would probably have readily submitted to such a Messiah and the innovations he might adopt. But if every truth must commend itself purely on its own account to men, especially is this the case with the highest truth; and nothing

this history, inasmuch as he comes back wherever it is suitable to Lazarus and his history, xii. 2, 9–11, 17–19. With regard to the grave clothes ver. 44, comp. xix. 40, xx. 5–7.

[1] *Ante*, pp. 64, 79.

was more necessary than that the consummation of true religion should present itself in the most humble and unimposing form to those who, as already individual members of that Community in which alone it could appear, must have been sufficiently prepared properly to recognise and gladly to receive it. The members of the Hagiocracy were by their entire education and position incapable of this; and they despised both the teaching and the works of Jesus, blinding themselves with all kinds of pretexts to the true nature of them. Inasmuch as they refused to receive the higher truth which was put so immediately before them, they necessarily became step by step its most uncompromising enemies, and fell into the delusion of supposing that they could destroy it by the removal of Jesus. If accordingly they now sought to effect his ruin by a charge of heresy, they were obliged to take care not to accuse him on a point with regard to which he might, as they could already be aware, easily defend himself; as, for instance, that he had persistently broken the Sabbath;[1] neither could a charge of that kind, as the practices of that time were, have easily procured the confirmation on the part of a Roman Governor of a sentence of death. But there was a side of the case from which the fatal blow could be more easily struck: this was precisely his claim to be the Messiah. This claim must now have been generally known, much as he had endeavoured to leave faith in him as the Messiah quietly to ripen in those only in whom this faith served solely as a stimulus of the perfect true religion; and the claim could easily be most dangerously misrepresented, greatly as he had from the very first sought to preclude every injurious misunderstanding. But if it was determined in the case of this his fundamental claim not to examine its meaning and basis, but simply to use it as a pretext for his death, there was no other assertion of his which was better adapted. For the very name and idea of a 'king' in those days, when the nation had been subjugated to the Romans, and after the experiences of the later Asmonean and Herodean times, could give rise to a vague and wide-spread alarm. The timid might tremble at the thought, that if perhaps the people should further follow this 'king,' a rising against the Romans still more terrible and disastrous than previous ones would be the result; at all events the dread of this spectre was capable of being widely spread, and nowhere with greater effect than in

[1] It appears from the utterances referred to above, pp. 290, 362 sq., how easily he could defend himself against this charge, which was certainly most entangling, as we have seen, pp. 291 sq.

Jerusalem and in the Sanhedrîn itself. And those members of the Hagiocracy in particular who intended in using this claim to exhibit greatest political prudence and to proceed with greatest possible astuteness, might suppose that by such an accusation against Jesus before the Romans they would further win from them even special favour and commendation for their watchfulness and caution.

Of the latter class was the reigning high priest Caiaphas. When the question regarding Jesus was considered at a sitting of the Sanhedrîn, and many were mournfully fearing that if he was permitted further to mislead the people the Romans might come to destroy the land and nation and annihilate the Sanctuary of Israel which had so often been imperilled, suddenly Caiaphas, as if a higher light had shone upon him, and almost ridiculing the rest, interposed the remark that he saw no danger in the matter, but, on the contrary, a great advantage which could be obtained for the people; that the death of one would procure great profit to the whole nation (namely, gain for it afresh the favour of the Romans): that they must consider 'how greatly it would advantage them that one man should die for the nation and not the whole nation perish;' just as according to the ancient ideas of sacrifice, probably amongst heathen nations also, it was thought that annually one man must die to appease the gods instead of the whole nation, and just as a distinguished criminal was also probably regarded on his execution as a ransom for the whole nation.[1] This reasoning of the high priest was at once considered as sufficient to justify a resolution; but we can understand that Christians subsequently, after their Master had fallen *for* the people and the whole human race so as to effect quite another result, found in that utterance the truest prophecy, which the high priest had in their view delivered against his will, and only as impelled by the higher spirit of his priestly office.[2] Thus many a one on other occasions probably foretells what is true against his own will, particularly in moments of such profoundly decisive importance; and it is only testimony to the guileless mind of the first Christians that they still continued to see in such an official utterance of the high priest something divine, and that to find this could alone give them satisfaction.

After this preliminary notice of the matter, the Sanhedrîn

[1] We can really see from this instance how easily human sacrifices might for this reason also become customary amongst the Carthaginians and other ancient nations: see *Antiquities*, pp. 69 sq.

[2] See *Antiquities*, pp. 291 sq. We see from xi. 49–52 comp. with xviii. 14, how much weight John attaches to it.

resolved that Jesus must be brought before its court, and that therefore anyone knowing where he was must signify it.[1] However, he had in the Sanhedrîn a friend in Nicodemus, above referred to;[2] it is not impossible that he was now warned by this friendly Pharisee. In fact, it would have been temerity if he had now at once gone to Jerusalem, as in defiance and simply to show himself before his mortal enemies. He felt that his time had not yet come: so he departed with the Twelve, not to the other side of the Jordan again, but still into the desolate region on the north-eastern border of Judea, not far from the Jordan, to a town called Ephraim.[3] The Easter feast was already at hand: and from that region where he was then staying many individuals were already departing to Jerusalem for it, particularly such as had to present previously a purifying offering that they might take part in the solemnities of the feast; for instance, lepers who though healed had not yet been pronounced clean by the priest.[4] Individuals of this kind who had arrived beforehand in the Temple were surprised that he was not already present: indeed, it was conjectured that he would not come at all this time: for it could not be generally unknown that the greatest danger threatened him in Jerusalem. But he had come to quite another determination.[5]

[1] John xi. 57.

[2] *Ante*, pp. 260 sq.

[3] John xi. 54, comp. with vol. iii. p. 172, v. p. 228.

[4] John xi. 55 comp. Mark i. 44, Luke xvii. 14, and *Antiquities*, pp. 67, 157–159.

[5] The question might here be raised, whether Christ did not once more go from this northern border of Judea into Galilee with the Twelve, particularly as even John does not mention many details regarding these last weeks before Easter. It might particularly be urged that the demand of the temple-tax, above mentioned (p. 356), is in favour of this supposition: for this demand fell, according to *Mishna* Sheqalim, i. 3, in the month of March—at a time, therefore, which would be quite consistent. However, the occurrence above mentioned could very well have taken place in the previous year, and would in that case have been received into that place in the Collected Sayings simply on account of its meaning and the connection. On the other hand, the circumstances mentioned above, pp. 357 sq., are in favour of the view that Galilee was left in the autumn. Christ appears, therefore, to have had reasons for not visiting Galilee again in these last weeks. And inasmuch as John in everything that concerns these last days of the Master so intentionally mentions carefully all important particulars, we have no reason for departing from him in this special case.

THE THIRD ELEVATION:

Christ's Temporal Destruction and Eternal Glorification.

His resolution as regards his time and his own past life.

While Christ clearly perceived that the world was fully determined to destroy him, or rather his work on the earth, as soon as it could possibly do this, on his part also there was no longer the pressing necessity which at first existed of completely avoiding the world's infatuation and rage, as formerly he had often done, and to the advantage of his own work. For notwithstanding all the obstruction of the time and all the opposition of men, his life-work in the founding and training of a Community of the perfect true religion had already been so firmly commenced that it could defy all storms; and his spirit, which is also precisely the spirit of the perfect true religion itself, had already found in this Community at all events such a possibility of existing and endlessly operating that he had no more cause to fear that it might again wholly vanish from this earth if he himself should be compelled to leave it in the body. This we have found above in the development of his unique history hitherto: and he himself perceived it at the time more clearly than anyone else. For if his life had become more toilsome and difficult after he had drawn around him the fixed limits of a new house of the perfected true religion, and to the care of the whole world had added this for the world nearest to him, he had still also experienced precisely during this last period moments of the highest and purest joy, and could already foretaste the infinite future glory which was about to arise in this Community. And while he had carried the chief work of his life so far that he could leave it to itself and Him in whose spirit he had founded it, he had also all along left nothing in other respects untried in order to promote its stability and continued operation in the world. His work was the revelation of the perfect true religion, its foundation on the earth by his own labour in it and for it alone, and the inexhaustible patience to commend it and in every way bring it near precisely to that people, or rather that Community, which had been previously most prepared and called

to understand and receive it. Whatever he as an individual placed in this age and in this particular body could do with all possible human-divine toil and love for this work he had perfectly and fully done, and at least as regards the deepest basis of things had not done in vain; indeed, there existed already in the midst of the great ancient Community of the true religion a new Community of the perfect religion, which, however small it might be, was still indestructible, and if it was but little developed, possessed within it a firm and infinitely expansive germ.

But precisely at this place, where all the strongest threads of the history of Christ, that had been long before connected, meet together and are about to be twisted into the tightest knot, it is appropriate to turn once more our glance back to its first commencement and its highest significance generally, that we may be able to look forward to its natural and logical issue without perplexity. It is above all things the coincidence of divine possibilities and of terrestrial actualities in the interworking of human freedom and human conditionality which can be most clearly traced in the issues no less than in the commencements of great historical developments: but as no former terrestrial history can, as regards the eternal truths of all divine-human life, be compared in point of transparent clearness and sublime teaching with the history of two thousand years which attains its summit precisely at this place, so again nothing can be more instructive than at this point to properly observe those divine possibilities and earthly actualities.

We saw above that Christ did not himself invent the idea and the divine need of a Christ, nor introduce it arbitrarily into life, and in so doing shape it at his will: but he met with a prophecy and a longing which was lodged in the inmost sanctuary of the consciousness of his people, and based on the highest necessity of the true religion that had become powerful in the earth at the time of his appearance; and he received the idea into his own being and permitted it to influence his work simply as its own natural and marvellous greatness and logical consistency required and all true religion demanded. By this very adoption of the idea that coincidence of human freedom and divine necessity, which could in this history become of such infinite moment and consequence, was prepared for. That this hope, thus constituted and thus wonderful, was a living power in the Community of the true religion, and had long been waiting for him who should satisfy it as that religion required,

was a divine necessity for this stage of human history: the manner in which Christ met this necessity, the way in which he alone properly attempted what had never been attempted, and as a human Messiah with human-divine resources, rose to strive to attain the divinely fixed and highest aim that could shine before any man—this was both the impulse and the direction and character of his own freedom. It is easy to perceive that an ancient hope, in proportion as it is exalted and comprehensive, must, if it is to be realised, gradually receive fuller and new forms under the human effort of its very realisation: the more difficult it is to realise in itself as regards its sublimity and in detail as regards its comprehensiveness, the more must the actual work of realising it alone show not only the means by which it can be attained, but also by what stages and what successive portions it can be gradually more and more completely realised, or what must be the proper commencement and what the progressive course of its realisation. In the case of Christ also it was his free choice as a man which permitted him to respond to the divine will and thereby to the divine predetermination at each of the stages which were in this matter necessary for him in the temporal development of his Messianic activity, and to respond in such a way that he did at each of these stages what was required by the hope and with the proper means. We have to this point seen that all this actually occurred in his case, and by how many stages has his work on earth already approached continually nearer to the divine object which had been put before him from the very first!

But if we look somewhat more closely at this object, as Christ himself must from the very first and most of all at this stage of his whole work have looked at it, in immediate relation to his personal human feeling, we may not ignore the fact that there was from the beginning and as long as his life as a man was involved in conflict with the elements of time, a twofold possibility as regards the human side of his work. As far as man was concerned it was on the one side possible that what he sought to establish in the earth should be much more rapidly and generally recognised and unanimously grasped as the true salvation of the race, and accordingly that the most painful and bitter mortal end should be spared him who desired no other object than to establish this salvation, and who alone was able to establish it. From the human side of the case this was conceivable, if mankind were judged from their nobler side: and it is from this side that he must judge mankind who will

undertake even on a small scale anything that shall benefit the race; nor would Christ have been rightfully Christ if he had not taken as his fundamental view of man this his nobler side, or if he had ever become unfaithful to it; for this is the point where the human itself comes into contact with the divine. But it cannot be denied that so far as man was concerned the opposite of all this was equally possible.

Let us clearly imagine what would at that time have happened if the better human possibility had been triumphant. It need not be said that Christ would not have sought for himself any earthly power or material enjoyment: it need only be observed, that no one is permitted to seek for himself such power and enjoyment. Accordingly Christ would have simply gone on continually to present the same most exalted and purest model of all human-divine conduct and ruling amongst men which he had given in the brief period of his actual life, and would have gone on to heal the same deepest ills of humanity with the cure of which he had been occupied with such great results. His kingdom, even if he himself had been able much longer to conduct its further and wider development, would never have become one like those which had been customary before: nothing can be more self-evident, or more certainly attested by all his own words and deeds, than this. And his own nation would then have been saved in the only way in which salvation was still possible for it; and, as with irresistible power, the true religion, which had long previously tended to spread from this nation, or rather from its ancient Community, to the heathen nations, and could only reach them through this channel, might have been able to become the salvation also of all these nations in the shortest time and without the desolating wars which actually ensued! Who can measure what would further have happened, what a long bright day would then have risen upon this earth? Who can tell all the thoughts and pictures which crowded unuttered in his soul also? It is presumptuous after the event to demand that human history, as it traces its iron zones through the earth, never apart from the higher divine possibility, should have been otherwise than it was; and it is doubly presumptuous to demand this in the case of this highest summit of all past human history. But that we may clearly perceive what the actual situation of things, as regards their still undetermined human possibilities, was in such great decisive moments, that we may be able to form a just judgment upon all the men who were more closely involved in their decision,

and more accurately perceive what weight of guilt or what innocence and sincerity, and what burden of labour and conflict rested upon the one side or the other, we cannot carefully enough consider at this point the human possibilities in both directions.

For the exact opposite of all the exceedingly glorious and happy things that we have just considered was also possible, in case the great multitude of the men of that time determined to misconceive and reject the salvation which was brought so near to them in this humble but only true way, and to entertain the more a mortal hatred towards him who brought it to them precisely because he laboured to bring it so near to them. But it has before been remarked,[1] and has to this point in his history evinced its truth so wonderfully in all the details above described, that Christ never from the very first deceived himself regarding this possibility, and that not the least thing was involved in its development for which he with his spirit of self-sacrifice was not beforehand fully prepared. In fact the ultimate object of his whole work must in his own mind have lain also far beyond this twofold possibility: and while he steadily with unvarying faithfulness kept solely in view the divine object itself, in the presence of it his human feeling and inclination in favour of the one or the other possibility must give way. Still, with his divine object invariably in view, and not so much forming a determination as rather already wont and without great effort determined to do in every stage of his work and every turn of his life what its pursuit required, he had always, as he recognised the divine will and as he everywhere anticipated it, been prepared for the most difficult and the most bitter lot, without on that account ever forgetting the better human possibility and making himself insensible to it. O how gladly would he at all times have seen this better human possibility realised, not so much that he himself might escape most profound suffering, as that they for whom he did everything from purest divine love might be spared the most terrible catastrophes and calamities of all kinds! To the very last moments of his life on earth his soul remained most alive and sensitive to it, and, indeed, was most painfully agitated with regard to it:[2] and when does the better human possibility ever come too late? Never to be cold and without feeling towards

[1] Pp. 240 sq.

[2] Who can more closely note the words and feelings of Christ as they are indicated Matt. xxiii. 37, xxvi. 42, xxvii. 46, as expressed in the last moments of his life on earth, without perceiving how little he was ever indifferent to the feeling of a better human possibility?

the possibility of a better issue of a temporal and human history, and yet to be nevertheless prepared at every moment with the same gladness and calmness for the most bitter suffering where in the prosecution of a divine object it is clearly perceived to be according to the divine will—it is when these two things are combined that we first see the highest human freedom and spiritual power attaining the full light and perfect blessedness of the divine predestination: and when this entire human-divine process turns as here upon the highest matters that have to be decided in the history of all true religion and its kingdom, what consequences are then possible!

Not cold and insensible towards a humanly better issue of the great struggle, but also prepared for whatever most painful sufferings might be according to the divine will; the more the hostility of the world was manifested to be the more ready even for the most extreme sufferings, without nevertheless ever losing sight of the better human possibility—this had been thus far Christ's inward attitude, and such it will remain to the end. In view of men generally, and particularly of the already closed circle of his Community, always unalterably holding fast the high object of his general work with all just Messianic hopes, but also placing before the eyes of his disciples all the serious aspects of their task and the dark lot which threatened himself, and this the more unreservedly as this lot seemed according to his clear foresight to be coming nearer—this was the attitude towards others which he had hitherto assumed; indeed the foreboding of his death, as we have seen,[1] he announced to his disciples early enough, although it was opposed to all the Messianic hopes.[2] The more the world sought to destroy his work just as it had been commenced, the more it had been his endeavour during the last year and a half to promote it by a retirement from the world; but this could not be his final intention, if the Community which had been founded by him was actually to become the beginning of a perfected Israel.

We have already explained the situation which gave him the assurance that he had no longer any need to fear as previously the most hostile and destructive collision with the representatives of the Hagiocracy and the people in Jerusalem, who were so easily misled by them,[3] or even with the world at large: for this populace in Jerusalem, dependent on the indulgences,

[1] Pp. 351 sq.

[2] It was quite possible to think of a Messiah who would suffer greatly with his people in his youth, according to Isa. vii. 15 sq., but not of a dying Messiah; comp. further below, vol. vi. [German].

[3] See pp. 87 sq.

pleasures, and advantages conferred by the Hagiocracy as it had then been brought to maturity in their midst, was certainly no less to be feared than the few representatives of the Hagiocracy themselves who sought his destruction.[1] It is involved in the whole position of such capital cities that everything that most concerns the kingdom, although it may have at first arisen very far from them, must finally be decided in their midst; and at the place where the highest truths can be proclaimed and the most widely operating salvation be fought for and won with the most intense effort, the utmost misapprehension and obduracy may no less easily prevail, and the most unutterable catastrophe be accomplished in wild passion. Previously the ancient Jerusalem, in which the noblest prophets laboured, was regarded as the cruel and unnatural mother of her own children and as the worst persecutor of the prophets: it was not otherwise with the new Jerusalem, as Christ himself on one occasion exclaimed.[2] Now again in Jerusalem the great decision with regard to Christ's cause was to be taken, a decision incomparably greater than any of the truly great earlier ones. He could foresee the issue of a fresh visit to this city, and if he consulted his human feelings could not desire it; but as regards the divine side of his cause he had no longer any need to fear or to avoid the worst issue.

Still it would have been likewise unworthy of him to bring about a final decision of this kind by an uncalled-for appearance in Jerusalem, and accordingly by his participation in its provocation. A sense of human justice and honour might have urged him the sooner and the more publicly to present himself there before the eyes of his enemies, and to defy them, precisely because the resolution had been taken there to destroy him: however, his cause no less than his mind was raised infinitely above every form of human provocation and human defiance. On the other hand, should a duty, independent of the arbitrary will of men, lead him thither, he could just as little hesitate to go there as shortly before to Bethany, near the Mount of Olives; and if he went, it followed from his whole position at this time, that on this occasion he would not seek to appear as the last autumn quietly and retiringly, but without reserve and publicly, though without intentionally attract-

[1] Just as no populace is more miserable than that of the city of Rome, which is dependent on the pleasures, luxuries, and feasts of the Papacy, and none in the sixteenth century in France was more devoid of conscience towards the Reformation than that of Paris under the sway of the Court of the Sorbonne and the Jesuits.

[2] Luke xiii. 34, Matt. xxiii. 37, comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 13, *Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. iv. p. 178.

ing attention. The higher duty to retire the less in fear before his enemies generally and not to forget his life-work in proportion as they grew exasperated, was now daily impressed upon him: so that if now a special obligatory occasion was supplied, his higher duty and the lower one coincided, and nothing might keep him from now departing into the midst of the most threatening danger.

Such an occasion arose with the Easter feast. Every man belonging to the nation of Israel was entitled, and indeed bound to take part in it at Jerusalem, although this duty admitted of exceptions and dispensations; nothing was looked upon as more natural and meritorious than the journey to the feast, nothing as more wicked than to interrupt a man's festive joy in Jerusalem. Accordingly he determined to set out this time to Jerusalem for the Easter feast. And he determined this time to appear with the Twelve, as everyone else was accustomed to do, in good time, unrestrainedly and publicly, without the reserve of the previous autumn, the reason for which no longer existed. In going thither he might consider his past life-work as the founder of a Community of the perfect true religion as practically finished, if it should so please his Father; he was aware of the danger to which he exposed himself, and foresaw clearly enough what might await him. But he knew still more surely that he was in this only obeying his higher duty; he prepared himself therefore in all calmness for the journey to the feast, and resolved not to make further the least commotion, though not to oppose any more public acknowledgment of a harmless nature that might be voluntarily presented; now also ready to proclaim in Jerusalem itself, as well as on the way thither, the same truth which he had all along brought so near to his nation; and although prepared for the worst, still neither inclined to misanthropy nor seeking death, and indeed even now not disturbing in his own soul the eternal hope for his own age also. He had always obeyed the divine will in everything; he obeyed it also in this (as he felt clearly possible) last earthly decision of the cause which he was still in the flesh representing, ready to suffer even the utmost for it, and yet no less certainly hoping down to the last moment of his earthly life in the divine help and mercy. It is the same wonderful combination and reconciliation of human freedom and perfect human feeling with submission to the higher Will, which we meet with in him in this case also, only in this instance it is exhibited most strongly and plainly, inasmuch as everything is now intensified for the highest decision.

To the highest significance of the remaining portion of his history, which is incomparably important notwithstanding its short duration, corresponds the sufficient fulness of our knowledge of it; no portion of the varied public life of Christ has been transmitted to us so accurately as regards all its apparently small occurrences as this last. For with justice nothing appeared, from the first times of the Apostolic age onwards, so important as to know certainly this last issue of the unique history most completely even to all its details; and although notwithstanding the endeavour to obtain the most accurate reminiscences some smaller discrepancies nevertheless arose, the stream of these narratives really flows nowhere else from all their various sources so fully and so uniformly as here. Neither did John find at last just here much to be more particularly stated: yet his additional details, when more closely considered, are certainly important and instructive.

1. *The last journey to Jerusalem.*

As Christ when he came to this determination was staying, as we have seen,[1] in the north-eastern corner of Judea, his route, if he now desired to take the most direct way to Jerusalem, would have lain at first to the west to the great high-road through Galilee and Samaria to Jerusalem. He would in that case not have touched Bethany on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, past which the journey was really taken according to both John and the earlier class of narratives. Precisely this way by Bethany on the east of Jerusalem, which John so distinctly reports, stands unmistakably in connection with the route over Jericho, which according to the earlier narrative he took on this last visit: and we have every reason to presume that the reminiscences of the earlier narrative were as accurate as possible precisely in the case of these events of the last period, which appeared everywhere so exceedingly important to be remembered, and that they must be treated by us as trustworthy in the highest degree when John does not contradict them and we have no other reason for doubting their statements. It is true the journey by Jericho could also start from the north-eastern corner of Judea; yet that would probably have been circuitous;[2] and a route by Jericho points rather to a journey from the country beyond the Jordan. As

[1] P. 375.

[2] We cannot at present use more definite language on this point, inasmuch as the precise situation of the town Ephraim has not yet been discovered.

now, according to the earlier narrative, when he is about to begin the journey to Jerusalem, Jesus comes first 'into the borders of Judea and beyond the Jordan,'[1] and thus approaches the capital by way of Jericho and Bethany, we have every reason to regard this as a fragment of recollected detail. In fact no obvious reason exists why Christ should now have chosen the most direct way: on the contrary, his whole life had indeed become at last more and more such an unsettled itinerancy, he had too so many adherents dispersed everywhere, and particularly the districts on both banks of the Jordan had become again, as the scenes of his first evangelistic labour, manifestly in these last times so dear to his memory that we can very well conceive how he should now resolve to travel from the north-eastern 'borders of Judea,' first over the Jordan, then back again over the river to Jericho, and afterwards to Jerusalem.

We may therefore also suppose that the various occurrences connected with this departure which the earlier narrative has preserved as particularly memorable, really took place at this time.[2] They were intrinsically, no doubt, not more remarkable than thousands of others of which the memory has not been preserved; but as having occurred just at the beginning of this last journey they subsequently appeared, like everything else connected with it, as worthy of special attention and more faithful recollection.

As this time he desired to commence the journey to the feast, as was customary with every other Israelite, in quite a public and solemn manner, many gathered about him before his departure, that they might from the most various motives address to him a last word; as it may also be inferred from the nature of the case that this time several besides the Twelve joined him for the journey. Thereupon some Pharisees also

[1] Mark x. 1 according to the correct reading, and with the καὶ which is omitted Matt. xix. 1; while if this particle is omitted, the construction must be regarded, just as Mark xi. 1, a similar case, as correcting itself. Really these words, which are of themselves somewhat brief and not easily intelligible, supply thus the most appropriate meaning; only that in this older narrative the autumn visit to Jerusalem had been omitted and the departure from Galilee accordingly brought into too close connection with this last journey to the feast from the north-eastern 'borders of Judea.'

[2] It would be possible, that is, to conjecture that these events, as they are related Mark x. 1 sq., were those connected with the departure from Galilee, accordingly belonging to the previous autumn, inasmuch as we cannot prove that Christ subsequently went into Galilee again. But this supposition is opposed by the fact that that departure from Galilee took place, as we have seen, pp. 358 sq., without any stir, and indeed, with intentional privacy: whilst all the occurrences here described no less than the express words Mark x. 1 b, 46, point to a departure that was quite public and generally known.

addressed to him the captious question, how he would decide respecting cases of divorce whether sought for by the husband or by the wife. These Pharisees had undoubtedly heard long before of the rigour with which he judged the practice of divorce; besides, the notorious case of the marriage of Antipas, the ruler of his country, in the snares of which the Baptist, we know,[1] had already been caught, was at that time, as we have seen,[2] everywhere spoken of. It could therefore be presumed that he also, like the Baptist, would permit himself to be entrapped in the obscure labyrinths of the subtle question; and thus this was only one of the numerous temptations into which his learned hypocritically religious enemies had long ago repeatedly endeavoured to lead him. However, he settled the question with such precision and with such perfect correctness that from this side he could not again be assailed.[3] When some children were brought to him for his blessing (as to take farewell), and the disciples sought to prevent what they regarded as disturbing to him, he devoted himself, on the contrary, most affectionately to the children, and used this occasion to teach that the childlike mind must be always preserved by those also who seek to be the most perfect in the kingdom of God. And just as he had started on the journey, there hastened to meet him a rich man (probably still somewhat young), to ask him, with marks of profound veneration, what he must do to obtain eternal life. His conversation with this man, how he put to the test his acquirements, and still more his spiritual readiness and receptivity for the duties of true religion, and how then on this occasion there arose between him and the Twelve a similar conversation regarding the highest duties and the rich hopes of the true confessors of Christianity,—all this more than many other things must have remained in memory, inasmuch as it occurred at such a rare moment, and concerned some of the last and most difficult life-questions of the new Community.

It may be easily supposed, and it is expressly mentioned,[4] that the journey to the feast this time was made with unusual seriousness. Though he himself advanced at the head of the Twelve and of the others who this time accompanied them courageously with unbroken confidence, already some gloomy trouble and a dark foreboding appeared to have fallen upon his attendants, and many followed him only journeying as under an obscure dread. But from the Twelve themselves he never

[1] P. 77.
[2] Pp. 199 sq.
[3] See on this point and on all the following occurrences, *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 376 sq.
[4] Mark x. 32–34.

concealed the mortal danger which he clearly anticipated was awaiting him in Jerusalem.[1]

But he carried through his object: and not a particle of the genuine hope connected therewith in even the external and visible triumph of the perfect kingdom of God could be given up. Thus it is in no way surprising that on this journey, which necessarily conducted (as all vaguely felt) to a crisis in some form, a certain contention regarding rank and honour broke out among the Twelve. The two sons of Zebedee, as we have seen,[2] stood from the beginning in closer relations with him than the rest, although he did not esteem less the energetic Peter, their senior, and his brother, and, indeed, was pleased to see Peter taking the lead of them all. James and John were probably of nobler descent and richer than the rest, and had sacrificed all their possessions for the sake of the kingdom of God now commencing, while they emulated the best in other respects with all decision and devotion. Moreover, they were now attended by their mother Salome[3] (probably by this time a widow), who had not less evinced the purest devotion to Christ's cause. They could therefore long have been looked upon as specially preferred even amongst the Twelve in the estimation of Jesus; and they were at that time themselves still of a sufficiently fiery disposition to expect the highest honours in the perfected kingdom of God in return for the highest sacrifices which they considered themselves able to make in the future also. Yet according to the more precise reminiscence,[4] it was in the first instance only their mother who ventured on this journey to address a word regarding the point; whilst that such a matter should be referred to even between them and the Master excited the jealousy of the rest, since they all considered themselves to be equally zealous, and could in most instances justly be of this opinion. The marvellous insight and truth which Christ revealed in connection with this most delicate matter, and the exalted wisdom with which he allayed such jealousies, still constitute the most valuable supplement to his discourses

[1] It really admits of no doubt that Christ uttered repeatedly and plainly enough such forebodings, although particular expressions in passages like Mark x. 33, 34 may have thus been definitely fixed in the more detailed final form of the Gospel narrative, and though the word *cross* especially, in passages like Mark viii. 34 (x. 21), Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24, Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27 (all of which passages, with the exception of the more than dubious Mark viii. 34, besides, go back to the Collected Sayings) may date its introduction from the habitual Apostolic phrase.

[2] Pp. 246 sq.

[3] P. 181.

[4] It is true the mention of the mother Matt. xx. 21, 22 has quite the appearance of being a supplementary correction of the earlier account Mark x. 35, 36, inasmuch as the mother is from ver. 22 onwards supposed to be no longer present; still in that case the supplement would all the more have a good foundation.

on the subject of government and power amongst men, those discourses, as we have seen,[1] belonging generally to these last times and finding in them their most truly fruitful place.

When he had gone over the Jordan to Jericho and was leaving the latter, accompanied by the numerous attendants of the whole journey, a poor blind man who had heard of his presence besought him as the Messiah to heal him, and, in spite of all who requested him not to interrupt the journey, could not be made to cease from his persistent cry for mercy. So Christ also, willingly interrupting his journey, came to the help of his firm faith. This event too, as Mark describes it in his graphic manner, would hardly have been so particularly handed down if it had not occurred in this last most important period; but the earlier narrative, as we have it in Mark, had, contrary to the customary manner, preserved even the name of this cured blind man—Bartimæus. And undoubtedly this man, as the narrative also indicates, remained ever afterwards a well-known and useful member of the new Community.

But there was still another conversion in Jericho which was narrated as dating from this journey. A rich Judean, by name Zacchæus, who as chief tax-gatherer of the town was not very popular,[2] had a great desire to see Jesus as he entered; and for that purpose, as he was of short stature, climbed a low mulberry tree by the road at a point outside the town where Jesus had to pass. No sooner had Jesus noticed him than he requested him to come down, as he desired to be his guest that day; and in spite of all those who murmured, he really took up his abode with the unpopular man. But his hope of opening to this 'son of Abraham' also the way of salvation, was soon most happily fulfilled: this same day brought salvation to the house of the disliked man, transforming him into a most active and sincere member of the kingdom of God. So fruitfully still operated the simple presence and beneficence of his appearance in any place, just as it had done previously. It may be remarked that Luke receives this little reminiscence of Zacchæus, which undoubtedly continued for a long time to produce its effect in the Apostolic age, from a later Evangelical work; and if he erroneously places that occurrence with Bartimæus at the approach to Jericho before this with Zacchæus, he probably in that also followed the example of this later work.[3]

[1] Pp. 355 sq.

[2] P. 54.

[3] At all events we cannot readily find any other reason why the first words Mark x. 46, which our present Matt. also read, should be altered by Luke xviii. 35,

From Jericho the direct way to Jerusalem leads by Bethany, which lies on the east of the Mount of Olives. It is at this place that John first resumes his narrative, partly because this village appeared to him so specially important on account of Lazarus,[1] partly because he finds here something to supplement and correct in the earlier narrative. According to the earlier narrative,[2] Jesus, as usual going out thither from Jerusalem for the night, was on the second day before the Passover at Bethany, in the house of 'Simon the Leper.'[3] While he was there at table a woman came with a flask of costly genuine ointment, and breaking the cruse poured this ointment upon his head. But some of the company of Jesus misconstrued this as waste, and supposed that the costly flask of ointment might very well have been sold for a high price and the proceeds given to the poor; as if they thought thereby to express the real preference of Jesus, who had always commended to his disciples a special regard for the poor. But Jesus, the narrative proceeds, exhorted them not to reproach the woman; she had done a good work on him: for poor people they had always with them, but him they would soon lose, and it could well be supposed that she had as aforehand anointed his body for the burying; but as her work had proceeded from pure love, it would, particularly as shown to him at a time when the love of the whole world was more and more turning away from him, in future be mentioned everywhere in the world with the Gospel itself in memory of her. Thereupon, it is further remarked in the earlier narrative, that Judas Iscariot went out to the high priests to betray Christ. If in this narrative therefore it is not expressly said that the betrayer belonged to those that murmured, it is still all but suggested to the reader, and is incontestably implied in the sense of the reminiscence generally.

But in this narrative the woman who had shown such love towards him was not more particularly indicated; and if the narrative became more isolated, a very different cause for the censure of her action might be conceived. We have seen before in the similar example of another somewhat later narrative,[4] that in those times, when the Gospel narratives were more and more generally talked about, Jesus was charged

and the whole narrative accordingly placed in another position.

[1] P. 368.

[2] Mark xiv. 1–11. Certainly it must be carefully noted as regards the chronology that it is referred to only vv. 1. 2; but these words are probably from the Collected Sayings.

[3] P. 368.

[4] P. 366.

specially with too much consideration for the weaknesses of women; and the Pharisees, as we see also from John's representation, were regarded more and more exclusively as his incessant critics and spies. By such a course that narrative of the woman who anointed Jesus appears gradually to have been carried over into closer connection with these most popular subjects of the general field of Evangelical narration, and, as interwoven in Luke's Gospel with the earlier times of the labours of Christ, to have received a freer form. Thus it was narrated, when Jesus, on having been invited to the house of a Pharisee, Simon,[1] was about to sit down to table, a woman dwelling in the city, but well known to be of loose life, came with a flask of ointment, dried his feet with the hair of her head, after she had wetted them with her many tears and kisses, and at last anointed them; but when the Pharisee then secretly wondered how, if he were a prophet, he should not know the previous life of the woman, Jesus described, in contrast with Simon's self-righteous conceit, which led him to cold hardheartedness, the self-denying love of this woman, which sprang from the sincere acknowledgment of her sins and the great longing for deliverance from their burden, and then at last actually forgave her her sins. One of a hundred similar stories, as they were at that time readily composed afresh from existing materials: so that it is not the subject-matter properly which is new, but only the varied and beautiful fitting together and reshaping. And it is precisely this later narrative which Luke, omitting the first one at its place in the history, manifestly receives instead of the first, and interweaves with the earlier portion of the Gospel history.[2] But if Luke by this procedure himself intimates to us that he considers one of the two narratives only as the reflex of the other, we have the less reason to mistake its origin.

It is, however, as if John had read both the above narratives, and endeavoured to correct what was defective in either, or what was a deviation into another region than that of strict history.[3] Thus he reports, first of all, that Jesus had come to

[1] This name has been omitted Luke vii. 36 on the adoption of the piece in its present position, but was undoubtedly originally found there, as appears from vv. 40, 43, 44. But then this name Simon, although now appearing only thus briefly, supplies a fresh proof that this second narrative was derived from the above earlier one as its final source; see above, p. 368.

[2] Luke vii. 36–50 after the Seventh Narrator [see Translator's Preface].

[3] It is perfectly obvious that John xii. 1–8 was written with reference to the first narrative, particularly from his selection of the unusual words vv. 7, 3, which can only have been repeated from that narrative; but the detail that Mary anointed his feet and further dried them with the hairs of her head, can, as far as

Bethany on the sixth day before the Passover. Inasmuch as John regarded, as we shall see below, the fourteenth of Nisan, or of the Easter month, on the evening of which the Passover was eaten, that year a Friday, as half a working day,[1] on which, particularly in the morning, all business could still be despatched, and yet counted it as likewise belonging to the Passover day,[2] it follows that he counted the thirteenth as strictly the day before the feast, and accordingly the Saturday as that sixth day when Jesus came to Bethany. He was unwilling, perhaps on account of the Sabbath, to make a long journey on this day, and had probably arrived from a place close at hand early in the morning. Secondly, he states that it was Mary, that sister of Lazarus in whose house Jesus took up his abode, who anointed his feet and dried them with her hair, so that the house was quite filled with the odour thereof, whilst Martha waited upon them, and Lazarus was one of them that sat at the table: and, in fact, a more probable statement than this could not be imagined.[3] Thirdly, he names definitely Judas Iscariot only as the man who had spoken reproachfully with regard to the waste of the precious ointment; and we learn at the same time the real cause which could mislead him to make such a remark. As the treasurer of the society he considered himself specially entitled to make such a provident comment, if unfortunately he had only not been likewise a thief, and had not misapplied for selfish purposes the money thus entrusted to him, and accordingly had not uttered that censure rather from an evil motive. Christ, however, then simply replied to him, according to John, 'Let her keep it thus for the day of my burial!'[4] as if he desired that this day should be regarded as already equivalent to the day of his burial, on which such a usage would be appropriate, if it would not have been fitting on other days, and would not have been sanctioned by him.[5]

The rest of this day he remained at Bethany: but as this

the last somewhat surprising phrase is concerned, only have been taken from the second narrative, where it is found in a connection much more like a primary and original one. An anointing of the head alone appears all that is required for the feast itself; but a simultaneous anointing of the feet likewise after a journey is no less appropriate; but the drying them with the hair is conceivable only in the case of tears and kisses, so that John must in this particular have simply used too great brevity.

[1] According to the custom of the time; see *Mishna* Pesachim, i. 1 sq.

[2] Follows from John xiii. 1 comp. with xii. 1.

[3] It appears, moreover, especially from the previous anticipatory remark xi. 2, how distinctly John desired to refer this anointing during the life of Jesus to this Mary solely.

[4] Τηρεῖν, xii. 7, can only be used as elsewhere of festive observances. [Comp. *Johanneische Schriften*, p. 331.]

[5] Which implies that this anointing had never previously occurred in the case of Jesus.

village, separated from Jerusalem only by the Mount of Olives, was situated in a very populous district, it is easy to understand how, according to John, on the same day many people came in the evening from the neighbourhood to this house, that they might see Jesus and at the same time Lazarus. Moreover, it was only consistent that the members of the Hagiocracy in the Sanhedrîn should themselves, as John relates,[1] since they had already given orders to seize Jesus,[2] also be maliciously disposed towards his host Lazarus and seek to destroy him. Meanwhile the rapid course of events soon relieved them of all their anxiety with regard to the hospitality of Lazarus.

The entrance into Jerusalem.

For it was his intention the next morning to make his entrance into Jerusalem, and he made quite publicly his preparations for this; and the representatives of the Hagiocracy, who, proud as they were, after all were really very timid, were destined to see him soon enough prosecuting his work close under their eyes. It does not admit of doubt that the entrance into Jerusalem which now took place was intended by him personally to be like that of a king, although it took this form of itself without his interference: he had now no longer any reason, in view of either the multitude or the representatives of the Hagiocracy, to disguise the fact or the consciousness of his being the Messiah. Moreover, according to ancient custom it was free to anyone about to go up to the feast to arrange glad or even splendid processions; and on such occasions a good deal was winked at by the authorities. Individuals, too, often entered Jerusalem for the feast some days or weeks before. Accordingly, for him also the present should be a day of glad and unmixed rejoicing, such as comes when a king enters into his kingdom. At all events he determined no longer to oppose the conviction and hope of the world if it should voluntarily hail him; and the conviction that his regal work on the earth was already completed as far as he himself could carry it, no less than his glad readiness to die, raised him on this day to a festive mood which was the exact opposite of that of his entrance into the city in the previous autumn.[3] Any perversion of this quite public Messianic appearance had no longer to be feared: in what sense he sought to be King and Lord could now be perfectly clear on all sides; or if any fresh misconcep-

[1] John xii. 9-11. [2] Pp. 374 sq. [3] P. 359.

tion about it should actually arise,[1] he could himself now easily remove it by a simple reference to his past and present labours, which were all along the same. His design was that the people of the ancient true religion, as it then still existed on the earth and had its centre in Jerusalem, should now see him quite publicly coming as the one who could alone save it in case it adhered to him with the faithfulness and love of the perfect true religion; his mission, moreover, had now been substantially accomplished on the earth; but inasmuch as he must himself be active and leave nothing untried in connection with it, it would have remained unfinished if he had not also attempted this last thing which he could still set in motion. Still he did not originate it as something undertaken with design and long-meditated astuteness: he this time simply suffered the public rejoicing of his adherents to express itself freely, just as on the day before he had only not hindered the unusual expression of regard in the house of his host at Bethany.

The only thing that he himself did in connection with the matter was that he mounted an ass-colt to make his entry. This way of appearing in public and of entering a town was quite unusual with him; that people knew generally, and accordingly regarded this resolution subsequently always with special consideration. The simple, believing, earlier narrative saw in the manner in which this colt of an ass was sought, found, and brought to Christ as the rightful Lord at his command, one of the ancient sacred omens of the auspicious beginning of a reign and royal procession:[2] it is thus the narrative appears still in the Gospel of Matthew and from this in Luke. Neither is it yet in this earliest narrative said that he spent the last night in Bethany and made his entry from this starting-place: on the contrary, it is quite in general terms reported, that when he drew near to Jerusalem and had already come to Bethphage and Bethany, he sent two of his disciples into the village over against them to fetch an ass's colt of this kind: by this village, according to all appearance, it is not Bethany at all that is intended, but Bethphage, which was situated somewhat further off,[3] the precise position of which

[1] Luke xix. 11 states that many then thought the kingdom of God must immediately publicly begin, taking the statement probably from an early source, perhaps the Collected Sayings: this supposition being the more likely, as the words ver. 11 seem rather to belong to such a connection as Luke xviii. 18–30.

[2] See on this further, *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 386 sq.

[3] [A supposition which is seriously doubted. See Keim's *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. p. 77 note 1. Tr.]

has not yet been discovered,—probably the same village from which he had come to Bethany the day before,[1] and which therefore had made so recently his acquaintance. But even if Christ never said at that time that he had chosen this entry upon the foal of an ass with reference to a Messianic expression of the Old Testament, as seeming to him in this case very specially suitable, it is still in itself probable, and in fact no other supposition is conceivable. The more frequently therefore these reminiscences were reflected upon, the more certainly was this, the real intention of the Lord as regards the choice of the manner of his entry, suggested; the last author of the present Gospel of Matthew already inserts the Messianic reference;[2] but far more definitely, and in a certain respect with admirable candour, John mentions that the disciples did not then know Christ's intention in this choice, but afterwards, on subsequent recollection of this time and this act, properly perceived the certain Messianic significance which it derived from the prophecy of the Old Testament.[3]

It is marvellous how in the mighty revolutions of high spiritual matters that have been once put in active motion, it may be even single and in themselves very unimportant outward and sensible things to which the further development and in the end the determination of the most weighty questions are attached as to mere projections and hooks that can be more readily laid hold of. These various sensible and material things emerge suddenly from the profound spiritual movement of a time and appear in themselves extremely unimportant, or indeed strange and singular: but from the deep lasting meaning and tendency of the movement they receive a significance far beyond the immediate surroundings which lasts for centuries and gives to them a spiritual importance which gradually corresponds less and less to their material aspect. Inasmuch as this contrast between their spiritual and material significance appears more and more prominently in the progressive development of the world, they may also remain, as having become wholly without meaning, as if without life and influence, and nevertheless they are, within the region of the whole movement

[1] Comp. *ante*, p. 391.

[2] Matt. xxi. 4, 5.

[3] John xii. 14–16. Although John quotes the same Old Testament passage Zech. ix. 9, he does so undoubtedly independently of the present Gospel of Matt. But nothing is more instructive than that Christ selected precisely this Old Testament prophecy for the glad procession of this day: he desired according to it to bring purely gentleness and peace. With reference to the significance of the ass, according to the feeling of the genuine ancient Theocracy in Israel and then of the Messianic hope, see vol. ii. pp. 130 sq., 241 sq., and *The Prophets of the Old Testament*, i. p. 315.

from which they once came into life, of such an imperishable meaning that at the very end of the long general movement they often become involuntarily a powerful lever for the acceleration of its final issue. What can be a matter of greater indifference than whether the horse or the ass, which was in those countries formerly so powerful, is ridden? But in that Egypto-Hebraic primitive age, from the midst of which the whole movement of this history of two thousand years sprang, the horse and the ass had acquired a perfectly special significance corresponding to the deeper meaning of the history, a special significance which had remained vividly enough during the whole of its first period in the national consciousness, was then subsequently preserved at all events in the thoughts and words of the greatest prophets, and now just before the end of the last period conducted, on the basis of a single utterance of these prophets, to one of the apparently unimportant deeds of Christ which in its results immediately decided everything and could alone conduct the vast movement generally to its proper issue.

It naturally followed that some of the assembled adherents should at once adorn this ass's colt by throwing their own garments over it; others going before the procession, according to ancient custom on such royal progresses, threw their garments as a carpet upon the road,[1] thus making it smooth and beautiful; many cut palm-branches from the trees of the neighbouring courts, thereby to honour the procession likewise according to ancient festive custom; and all, those in front and those behind, sang a short Messianic song, which was composed impromptu in the elevated mood of this moment, and may be called the first hymn of the new Community, and according to numerous indications was long much sung in the first times of this Community.[2] In its original and complete form it ran:

Give victory to the son of David!
Blessed is he coming in the name of the Lord,
Blessed the coming kingdom of our father David!
Give victory in heavenly heights!

As soldiers accustomed to victory and filled with its hope address to their commander words of lofty courage and pray for him to heaven, so the winged words of this stanza are on fire with the confident spirit of the victors of primitive Christianity, like true words of the banner around which the first hosts of the

[1] Comp. *Ibn-Arabshâh Fâk.* p. xxvi. [2] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 387 sq.

19.

Messianic faith gathered: and we cannot doubt that they were heard for the first time precisely on that day, being subsequently never forgotten and repeated in innumerable forms. It is true that John refers only briefly and in passing to the events of this entry generally: for with his general view of the comparatively small importance of the national relation of Christ to Israel, this event, which of all others was most national in its character, might seem to him as of less significance. But undoubtedly the event was at the time one that provoked unusual attention. The entire capital, the earlier narrative states,[1] was stirred by it, although most of the people would recognise in the entering hero only a prophet. And no less certainly were this rejoicing amongst the people and this intense and glad expectation of victory on the part of his more immediate adherents kept up for some time during this week that had just begun. As even the boys in the streets began continually to sing that song of challenge, and some of the representatives of the Hagiocracy called his attention to it, he replied to them, that according to the Old Testament itself, God was best pleased to be praised by the mouth of the young;[2] or, according to another narrative, that if they held their peace the stones would cry out.[3] But John, inasmuch as he lays, for reasons above-mentioned, such a great stress upon the story of Lazarus, reports, how particularly that story, as attested and generally retold by so many who now entered with him, attracted on this entry the general attention to him.[4]

The last public labours in Jerusalem.

Accordingly he had again come into as close proximity as possible to his mortal enemies, appearing at the feast earlier than many of them expected,[5] and undoubtedly with much more publicity and celebration than they had dreamed of. They might now have thought of at once carrying out their previous resolution to take him prisoner, particularly as he had now publicly enough shown himself as the 'king' of Israel: but the multitude of his adherents filled them with no little fear, since in addition to his more immediate friends the masses of the people appeared for the moment not wholly unfavourable towards him, and at all events regarded him as a 'prophet' and benefactor of the suffering.[6] Accordingly for

[1] Matt. xxi. 10, 11.
[2] Matt. xxi. 15, 16.
[3] Luke xix. 39, 40.
[4] John xii. 17–19.
[5] As appears so plainly also from the simple trait John xi. 56.
[6] Mark xi. 18, Luke xxii. 2, xix. 48, John xii. 19; comp. Matt. xxvi. 5.

the moment they permitted him to move and work without restraint, though everywhere keenly watching him and hoping that soon some favourable circumstance would support their desire to destroy him.

He now began again immediately his wonted labours in the capital also. He could nowhere avoid seeing that ruin and death threatened him at every step; but quietly continued from that moment of higher joy and the jubilation of the multitude to pursue his work in his accustomed manner: he again healed all kinds of afflicted people,[1] and he particularly taught more powerfully and decidedly if possible than before. The nights he spent with his friends in Bethany on the further side of the Mount of Olives,[2] later in a garden on the western slope of it: he was always every morning early in the Temple. The days and the hours were now still more indispensable than before; every moment left infinitely precious. He had now, indeed, done all that was humanly possible to be done and attempted. After he had openly at the prominent sacred centre of the nation of the true religion shown himself as the 'king' of the perfect true religion which included within it the genuine kingdom of God, it was now the business of the nation generally of both the higher and the lower ranks to decide no less publicly for him, that is, to seize with complete sincerity and heartiness that perfect religion which he had shown to them, and as whose living exposition and illustration of its operation he himself appeared in their midst. Therefore he could for his own part really only continue as he had begun: but after that moment of public declaration he was no less unwearied in his efforts to present more and more plainly (if this was still required) and urgently this religion to the whole nation.

It is in many respects not unimportant to observe, that now, after the public sign which he had given by his entrance itself, Christ could not find it appropriate to his position and the great cause which he represented to give some new sign of that kind regarding himself; and as a fact he really gave none. He could not in conformity with his higher duty regard his labours as ended with his public entry, and in inactivity on his part expect that the people would now of themselves come to him and remain faithfully with him; for he brought too unusual things for this, and such as procured at the same time

[1] According to the incidental remark Matt. xxi. 14.

[2] According to the earlier narrative Mark xi. 11, 12, 19, 20, comp. xiv. 3, which has become less clear in Matthew; Luke also, xxi. 37, expresses himself less definitely.

too little earthly power and external splendour. He was necessitated to labour on as he had begun in order to make men more and more closely acquainted with that which he brought to them: but a new public sign was neither necessary nor useful. It is true the earlier narrative erroneously places the purification of the Temple, above discussed,[1] in this time;[2] and this act, if performed immediately after the public entry, would have had a far more significant meaning and object than it could have at the first inauguration of the entire Messianic movement; it would have been not merely a great authoritative act of him who had just been declared king, but also a sign that his kingdom had now actually begun with his entry, and an admonition that accordingly his disciples and the rest who had now given their adherence to him should at once put their hands with no less violence to the alteration of the existing state of things. However, according to the other indications, not the smallest act proceeded from him which his enemies, or his own disciples, could regard as violent: on the contrary, he deprecated most earnestly even the first solicitations to such acts; and the earlier narrative itself knows nothing of a participation of the disciples in that purification of the Temple. But John, who is evidently intentionally silent with regard to it in this place, has undoubtedly for good reasons transferred it to a much earlier period, to which, as we have seen,[3] it belongs according to all internal evidence.

But the last great decision approached rapidly enough within these very few days. Christ had not appealed exclusively to the lower or the less intelligent classes, still less had he resorted to any act of violence, or even so much as in any way taught that outward force might be used. Accordingly, his appeal and his demand were all along primarily directed most powerfully and unambiguously to those who in some way claimed to be leaders and teachers of the people, who had also the public reputation of being such, and were responsible to God for the authority allotted to them in the Community. They had also, as was shown above, themselves long perceived that his words and his censures were always primarily directed chiefly to them, and undesignedly incriminated them most of all. He now appeared once more in their midst; and precisely at that spot where all the most various influences of the time met in

[1] *Ante*, pp. 254 sq.

[2] Namely, really on the day after the entry, Mark xi. 15–18: whilst the present author of the Gospel of Matthew makes him execute the purification of the Temple immediately after the entry, Matt. xxi. 12–15.

[3] Pp. 254 sq.

the greatest activity, and whence they reacted in all directions most forcibly, the divine truth was now once more brought near to them: but only in order that all should immediately, once more and for the last time, simply unite most desperately against that one man, to follow whom they had all long ago rendered themselves inwardly incapable. This is the great historical truth which the earliest narrative[1] already most clearly expresses at this place, when it describes how at that time all the ecclesiastical and scholastic authorities in Jerusalem, dissimilar as they were in other respects, both as regards their earlier history and their present position, made a last attempt on Jesus in the Temple,[2] proposed to him, respectively in the best way they could, captious questions, were all refuted by him and soundly corrected, and nevertheless none of them allowed themselves to be truly taught and made better by him. The Sanhedrîn, taking the lead as was becoming, questioned him regarding the authority of his action generally; he put them to silence simply by representing his action as that which it was—the simple logical consequence of the action of the Baptist, whom they surely did not mean to regard as a deceiver. The Herodians and Pharisees, at other times at enmity with each other, sought, in this matter at least agreed, to ensnare him by captious questions of a national bearing; but they did no more thereby than still more plainly bring out his unfailing wisdom. The Sadducees endeavoured to annihilate him by mockery and quibbles; and simply helped thereby to make themselves ridiculous. A proud Scribe wished to damage him by his subtle learning; and thereby simply effected that in this respect also his unsurpassed intelligence had to be confessed. Thus the attacks of all upon him effect the very opposite of what was intended: and, alas! he must himself close with the most righteous condemnation of the wholly perverse behaviour, habitual tendencies, and position of the spiritual chiefs of that time. If several of the questions in dispute and of the discourses which this earliest narrative and another early one and later Gospels refer to this most decisive place may have originally occurred at other times, the meaning of them in this combination is appropriate enough to present graphically, precisely at this stage of the history, the truth, that neither at any previous nor at this last and most decisive moment could any deliverance proceed from any one of the ecclesiastical and

[1] Mark xi. 27—xii. 44; comp. further *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. 390 sq.

[2] It appears from the note, *ante* p. 360, in what part of the Temple he was then most frequently found.

scholastic authorities as they then existed in the nation. And accordingly with these spiritual authorities the entire Community, even in its deeper spiritual bases, would have been completely corrupt and wholly lost in the view of the Messiah, had not his eye even then still discerned, as in a still deeper secret basis, in the Temple itself one of the most moving instances of that faithfulness and sincerity of devout life which always remain the indestructible foundation of all true religion. Thus beautifully and with such unsurpassed truth, this great piece of narrative closes by presenting the picture of the poor widow who, probably observed by none but Christ, cast more comparatively than all the rich into the Temple treasury.[1]

Undoubtedly he had long ago perceived that there lay in the deeper soil of the ancient people a more uncorrupted germ, out of which the Community of the perfect true religion could start forth should the rays of the true sun fall upon it; in fact he had already derived the Twelve from this same germ. But if all the ruling authorities of a nation have long become incorrigible, as was at last plainly decided to be the fact during these few days, it is as if in that case a carefully planted and tended fruit-tree were met with from which nevertheless fruit was vainly expected, and which therefore had better not longer exist. It is not surprising that such thoughts, which had long agitated the heart of Christ as he remembered the history of his people, occupied him very specially in these last days, and rose to a heat which had never burned in such flames in him before; nor is it surprising that he really permitted them free expression on every occasion which naturally presented itself. Accordingly, the appropriate trait found its way already into the earliest narrative, that as on the morning after his entry into the city he went again to it from Bethany he hastened just when he was hungry to a luxuriantly growing fig-tree that promised fruit,[2] but found no fruit on it, and therefore uttered a curse against it for having so sadly disappointed his hope; the very next morning, the narrative says, when the tree was passed again, it was found wholly withered away. Without doubt it was a far higher thought than that about a mere fig-tree which then so profoundly moved him, and provoked such a memorably hard word from his lips. That immediate destruction

[1] Mark xii. 41–44, Luke xxi. 1–4, with the notes generally in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 391–406.

[2] With regard to the figs which sometimes occur unusually early, see a recent authority, Lynch, *Narrative of the United States Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea*, London, 1850, p. 397; on other points see Tobler's *Denkblätter aus Jerusalem*, pp. 101–103.

now inevitably awaited the people of Israel was the terrible thought which in these days more than formerly specially assailed him so fiercely, and which found its mildest relief in the curse upon the fig-tree. Neither did he doubtless repress his dark forebodings regarding the imminent destruction of Jerusalem, as the earliest reminiscences variously announce this;[1] the history also will itself teach soon enough how little he was deceived and how terribly his dark utterance was fulfilled. And thus it is as if, in those first times before the destruction foretold of Jerusalem overtook it, a presage was found in the unexpectedly early withering of that fig-tree of the fulfilment of that much more serious prophecy, and for this reason this story of the fig-tree on that road was so often repeated. For undoubtedly there were in Jerusalem still, even among the members of the Sanhedrîn and the more or less influential supporters of the Hagiocracy, both in that most decisive time and also subsequently, several very honest individuals who were unwilling wholly to reject the cause of Jesus, as John especially indicates definitely enough:[2] but the more threateningly the danger gathered around the head of the purely celestial combatant the more timid they also became, and permitted to be done whatever they supposed they could not prevent, or at most showed from compassion some interest after the dreaded blow had fallen. But thus they acted as if they had not been present, and by their timid half-heartedness only contributed to the general ruin.

Although the heads of the nation thus failed to fulfil their vocation, he still did not on that account even at this last moment appeal to the passions of the masses, although they had in the first hours of this time hailed him with such specially jubilant expectation. It is precisely this final relation of the various sections of the people generally which is brought out by John alone at this point, just as it had been at once decisively enough manifested on that day of his public

[1] That story of the fig-tree originally without doubt pointed to such prophecies regarding the destruction of Jerusalem, see *Die drei ersten Evang.* pp. 390 sq. The simple parable of the barren fig-tree, Luke xiii. 6–9, has very similar meaning, the allusion to the three years already past of useless waiting for fruit pointing naturally to Christ's several years of labour. As to other woes over Jerusalem, which probably date back to somewhat earlier times, see *ante*, p. 366. But his prophecies, particularly regarding the end of Jerusalem and the entire ancient condition of things, are put together at greatest length from the Collected Sayings in Matt. chs. xxiv. xxv. See *Die drei ersten Evang.* pp. 407 sq.

[2] John xii. 43, where also the chief general cause which restrained them is very correctly stated in a few words. And as John always likes to illustrate all general statements by a special example, the Nicodemus referred to above, pp. 260 sq., was undoubtedly meant by him to supply an example of all similar ἄρχοντες τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

entry. For as we have seen,[1] John had so fully described, in connection with the last autumn journey to Jerusalem, what his relation generally was to the rulers especially, that at this point he communicates no further important details respecting it: from them there had now, according to that description, long threatened him nothing short of death, as he himself knew, and consequently, according to John, no further important public contention whatever arose between them. The masses of the people, on the other hand, although according to John[2] they had in the previous autumn, under the influence of the members of the Hagiocracy, once declared against him, had still remained less prejudiced than their rulers, and had just now favourably received him again: it was therefore still a question what precise form their relation to him would take at the last moment; and from this point of view, too, that day of the public entry, according to John, also had its great significance, and indeed became a solemn closing day of the general public labours of Jesus. And as John likewise distinguishes, but at the same time describes quite independently in his own characteristic manner, all the most prominent summits of the Gospel history, although the earlier Gospels had already described them, so in this case he sketches unmistakably in his own manner the picture of that celestial transfiguration of the entire terrestrial labours of Christ, as it sought to break forth in one sudden gleam, which the previous Gospels, as we have seen,[3] had partly transferred to a somewhat earlier period and to another earthly scene. But on that very account there are only, according to John, a few further grand lines which now remain to complete the entire picture of the public work of Christ.[4]

There were (says John) on that day (as may easily be supposed) a considerable number of Hellenes present amongst the visitors at the feast. These Greeks were, according to John's opinion, undoubtedly Greek Judeans,[5] either by birth or proselytes from the heathen. All Judeans living amongst Greeks and other heathen in the Roman empire were at that time regarded as more free-thinking and less preoccupied by national prejudices.[6] Some individuals could early anticipate

[1] See pp. 361 sq.
[2] See pp. 365 sq.
[3] See pp. 353 sq.
[4] John xii. 20-36, with the general conclusion vv. 37–50.
[5] The description of their purpose v. 20 itself points to this conclusion, but still more definitely what John had said concerning this Diaspora ch. vii. 35; they are therefore identical with the Hellenists, only that the short name Hellenes is so significant precisely in the case of John.
[6] See vol. v. p. 249 sq.

that Christianity would extend more rapidly amongst them than in Palestine itself; as soon, in fact, the Apostolic history taught, and as John particularly had deeply learned long before he wrote this passage. At an earlier place, therefore, John had expressly stated that some had misunderstood an utterance of Christ as if he meant, tired of the Judeans in the Holy Land, to depart to those dispersed among the heathen, in order to bring them over to his Messianic teaching.[1] On that day, John proceeds, some of these Hellenes spontaneously desired to become more closely acquainted with Jesus; they applied therefore to Philip, above mentioned,[2] who, however, first ventured to lay their request before the Master when he had obtained the assistance of Andrew, who was more intimate with him. And if he had wholly listened to such requests, and now devoted himself fully to the Hellenists, what an entirely new situation of affairs would he thereby have yet brought about in this final phase of his labours thus far, what commotion in the land and what unforeseen perplexity to the representatives of the Hagiocracy would he have been able to cause! We can really properly appreciate this from the history of the Apostolic age, when in general Christian doctrine was more eagerly accepted and more firmly adhered to by none than by the Hellenists. Accordingly, this (as we can perfectly well suppose) became the last temptation of Christ in these last moments of the extreme crisis: but he was not for an instant doubtful as to what was in this case to be done.

Not in that way: not by commotion amongst the people, or by help from without, could the great cause, which alone he had hitherto represented, carry off the victory. He had long been determined to die for it, if it must be, and anticipated that only by that means would it triumph. And although the thought of death, the nearer it approached, necessarily affected him as a man more profoundly, he would not pray to his Father to save him from this hour, but only that His Name might be glorified by his death also, in the certain expectation that thus at last the Messianic cause itself also, and the Messiah in his divine aspect, would meet with eternal glorification instead of being destroyed.[3] And as he then intimated to them that he

[1] John vii. 35.

[2] See p. 302.

[3] The close of these words, John xii. 27, 28, shows the unusual agitation of soul with which the speaker is seized, even in the rapid haste of the thoughts as they are crowded together: 'and what shall I say, "Father save me from this hour!" (shall I say this? would it be right?) but for this cause (in order to meet this end, through death to glory) I really came to this hour; (therefore I can and will say nothing else than) 'Father, glorify thy name!' By this alone the glorifying of the Son of Man also is conditioned, from which the discourse started ver. 23.

had then no more time for such new human acquaintanceships and connections, and closed his words with the highest and purest prayer possible to the Father in the most intense agitation, there then came (John relates) from the Father also the true answer, and a clear heavenly voice made this answer known to the earth: as always higher transfiguration and glory follow victoriously-resisted temptation. But as the people (proceeds John) supposed that they had merely heard it thunder, or others tried to persuade themselves that at most an angel had spoken to him, he gave them to understand that a voice of that kind was not for his sake at all (as if he still stood in great need of strengthening and confirmation), but for their sakes, that their faith might be strengthened; he himself knew how from that moment all spiritual things had already been decided, and in spite of his outward departure, and indeed just because of it, the time of the glorifying of his entire cause was beginning. As, however, they still regarded this as incomprehensible, he then admonished them at least to make good use of the brief time of his visible presence amongst them.—As the descriptions of John can in so many places be compared with a bird that boldly soars into the highest heaven, and then there in the purest height moves calmly hither and thither, until at length it softly alights again, so in the case of this very short but most exalted passage we find such a comparison appropriate. With the boldest flight the thought this time immediately soars, when the proper occasion has been supplied, to the most sublime truth and to the highest desire and prayer, not in vain desiring from heaven itself a response and answer: but if anyone should misconceive the nature of this celestial voice, its true object and its one proper significance are further declared to him from the same elevation; and in the most gentle descent there is at last taught what must absolutely be done forthwith by everyone. And this is the story of the glorification of Christ, while still in the midst of his earthly life, with which John himself in his own way again glorifies the account of the earlier Gospels.[1] For this moment, which he subsequently dwelt upon in memory, seemed to him to have even still more highly illustrated and glorified the significance of the whole earthly life of Christ while he was still in the midst of his active labours, than that moment which was spoken of in the ordinary narratives.

But the point which, according to John, at last produced therefore once more a decisive effect in the case was, that

[1] *Ante*, pp. 353 sq.

precisely the whole nation of the true religion, as it then was, in general proved that it did not possess the courage and resolution to follow him faithfully and sincerely, having been blinded by all kinds of grievous prejudices. The masses of the people hailed him with rejoicing for a short time, but soon grew more silent again when they did not see forthwith realised by him that great immediate outward prosperity which alone they really always sought from him, and feared accordingly that all they would gain from him was his severe requirements. And in the end, precisely in matters of external success, happiness, and prosperity, all the various aims and divisions of a nation disappear within it if it generally falls short of its duty. Great as the fault of its chiefs at that time was, had not the nation itself during a long time permitted them to become what they were? And did the people finally adopt at the last moment proper means of reforming the spirit of its chiefs? As all the specific aims and parties proceed in the first instance from the whole nation itself, so in the end their errors and mistakes always fall upon it collectively. Israel as a nation ought to have known that the purely divine, as far as it can come in humanity, appeared, with all the infinite blessing that lies hidden within it, in this humble form borne by Jesus of Nazareth: that Israel did not do this is ultimately solely its sin of unparalleled magnitude. And just this, therefore, is properly the last decisive word which, according to John, Jesus speaks concerning this its general relation to him, although expressed only in the form of those general truths and principles which transcend everything of a merely national character, and can really be applied equally well to every nation and every individual.[1]

His betrayal. His outward overthrow and his eternal hope; his outward separation and his eternal presence.

Even according to the earlier class of narratives, that kind of outward sympathy of the people generally which the heads of the

[1] John xii. 44-50. It is therefore a frivolous question to ask where and when Jesus uttered these words, comp. vv. 36, 37; John himself really received them simply as the great truths which as *proclaimed aloud* by Christ belong most of all to this connection, inasmuch as they contain the most severe condemnation of the general bearing of the whole nation with regard to him, for all who will further reflect upon their meaning. And inasmuch as they contain only the most general truths, save that at this point they can most plainly prove what the Apostle had asserted vv. 37–43, Jesus might also have uttered them previously and upon another occasion, as in fact so much of them occurs here and there in earlier parts of the Gospel. This is manifestly the view which John had when he placed these words here.

Hagiocracy had reason to fear in connection with their deadly plots against Christ, very soon grew weaker in the course of these few days. The people saw none of the material splendour realised upon which they had mainly set their hope on the day of the entry. Accordingly their more earnest zeal soon grew cold again, and in fact, in the case of not a few, changed into its exact opposite; and if the representatives of the Hagiocracy continued all along not wholly without the fear that an arrest and condemnation of Jesus, at all events on the coming feast-day, when dangerous popular tumults always most easily broke out, had better be deferred,[1] they perceived nevertheless clearly that the sympathy of the populace had not at all events been increasing since the day of his entry; and they might thus expect after all soon to obtain their object if some favourable accident should come to the assistance of their incessant vigilance and desire to kill him. And an accident of this kind was about to take for them such a favourable turn, that they obtained completely their object even before the dreaded feast-day.[2]

But this very thing is the best evidence of the extreme excellence and inward glory of the cause of Christ that, with all their own assiduous vigilance and all their fully pronounced hostility, they still did not venture, notwithstanding the growing lukewarmness of the people, upon any step to take his life until an act of treason on the part of one of his own immediate followers came to their assistance. So surely is the general truth confirmed by this highest historical instance, that a cause which is absolutely good in its deepest basis and origin can be really damaged only by a treasonable act from its own midst. All, therefore, that really concerns us in this case for the present is correctly to perceive how such an act of treachery in such a Community as this was possible, even thus early in its course, and under the very eyes of Christ. Treason in a good cause, when it appears, is always simply the outcome of some want of clearness and confusion that has long been present in the general body, though very much concealed and unobserved; and which is only accidentally, as it were, more fully concentrated in one member, and is brought by him through his special guilt to a violent collision.

Now, we have seen above[3] how inevitably Christ's cause, notwithstanding its original absolute goodness, must by the

[1] Mark xiv. 2.

[2] The object of the short reference to this fear, Mark xiv. 2, is manifestly to indicate this; comp. further below.

[3] Pp. 306 sq.

very foundation of the Community descend into the midst of the accidents and weaknesses of the terrestrial world. Everything that belongs to the earth, if it will get into order, establish itself, and make progress, must adapt itself to certain definite limits, series, and numbers. As the first firm stones and foundations of his Community, as far as this is and must become something temporal, Jesus chose his twelve Apostles, adopting a suitable number which had been supplied to his hand and could not very well be disregarded. He chose the Twelve undoubtedly as the best men whom he could select to fill up the number, and not one of them *in order that* he might become the traitor. But we may say of the very beginning of this choice what Christ, according to John,[1] said regarding it at the end of his earthly course: 'He knew whom he chose'—that is, that in accordance with the general diversity of men's spiritual natures, all would not without exception necessarily take uniformly the same relation to the great cause itself which ought to unite them; that the most various grades in their characteristic aims and tendencies, on the contrary, might appear precisely on account of the unusual elevation and difficulty of their vocation; a gradation which might possibly reach so low as the complete misapprehension of the most certain truth, if some new and special temptations should arise. That which requires the most difficult and faithful employment of the human mind requires also the greatest freedom of activity and resolve. Christ did not choose the Twelve to deprive them of this freedom, when he was obliged to fix upon and fill up a definite number of intimate disciples.

Judas Iscariot was, as we have seen,[2] entrusted with the money affairs of the new Community, inasmuch as they had necessarily to be taken special charge of by some one of its members. Accordingly, in a case where the whole soul ought to be directed solely to the things of the kingdom of God, this member must also be occupied with earthly things of that nature, inasmuch as they also were indispensable. In this there was involved for him a special temptation: the accumulation and keeping of money can always become gradually too great a pleasure to men; and if in this occupation a man's mind easily acquires covetous, selfish, and thievish habits, he may always suppose that he can excuse himself, inasmuch as his office urges him to accumulate and lay up as much money as possible; indeed, the temptation thus to provide against all possible emergencies and vicissitudes of life may

[1] John xiii. 18. [2] P. 305.

become the stronger in proportion as the possession of treasures of this kind is despised by the other members of the society, or perhaps the non-possession of them is made into one of its principles.[1] Judas Iscariot succumbed to this temptation. We owe the knowledge of the fact to John's more accurate accounts, and undoubtedly without them the conduct of Judas at last would be historically much less intelligible than there is any occasion for it now to be. His growing passion for money could in the course of this year and a half remain long unobserved and craftily concealed by himself; but though Christ had never till that moment uttered an angry word with relation to it, still the implied reproof which he had given him shortly before, as we have seen,[2] might, under the consciousness of his general guilt, have unpleasantly affected and mortified him. If, now, in such a mood he also found during the days immediately following the festive entry that the expected kingdom of God, from which he, with his now overpowering propensity, necessarily looked principally for outward treasures and advantages,[3] refused to be realised as he in secret hoped, and further found that the people generally remained comparatively lukewarm, might not the desperate thought suddenly seize him to speak in any case with the chief authorities, who as he knew had already set a price upon the head of this Messiah? Might he not represent to himself that it would be in any case well to have a conversation on the matter with them? For we may without doubt suppose that probably some days before his last separation from the Master, he had transactions with certain members of the Hagiocracy;[4] and it is easy to suppose that if he would offer his hand for such an undertaking they would represent it to him as an exceedingly meritorious one, and would also on their part now strongly urge him to it by every means. Nothing else is to be expected from him than that the money promised for the betrayal, together with the further material advantages which might be briefly intimated to him as in the background, would also prove very attractive to him; but, on the other hand, much less could anything

[1] This is the reason why in general so much covetousness and so much care for material things get the upper hand precisely in the case of monasteries and monks, Buddhistic as well as Christian. But, indeed, that parable of the unrighteous steward, Luke xvi. 1–13, applies here as very specially instructive; on which comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 367 sq.

[2] P. 389.

[3] To which there is an allusion even in the words of the saying Mark x. 29, 30, Matt. xix. 29; at least *lands* are here also mentioned, while they are apparently intentionally omitted Luke xviii. 29.

[4] This is implied in Mark xiv. 10, 11 compared with vv. 17 sq. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 14–16, Luke xxii. 3–6. This is referred to much more briefly John xiii. 2.

occur more acceptable and advantageous to the members of the Hagiocracy than the opportunity of arresting Jesus before the eyes of the world by his betrayal at the hands of one of the Twelve.[1]

Accordingly two things combined in this case to lead Iscariot to such a transaction, as will often be the case in all important decisions that spring from impure motives. His mere greed of money would hardly have led him to the horrible deed: the amount of the money offered him by the members of the Hagiocracy was probably quite small; neither would the fear of the discovery of his love of gold, and his possible punishment in the circle of the members of the new Community, alone have driven him to it: to that time it had probably scarcely been much observed, and undoubtedly had not yet been made the subject of intolerable reproaches on the part of Christ himself. It is, indeed, quite intelligible that subsequently amongst the first Christians the love of money was in the first instance alone thought of as the sole motive of such a dreadful deed. It is, moreover, unmistakable that this Iscariot afterwards really accepted the reward of his shame; and with this money, and perhaps [2] with some besides which he had saved, purchased a field near Jerusalem.[3] This field, for some reason unknown to us, had borne till then the name of the *Potter's field*,[4] but was called by Christians subsequently, for quite intelligible reasons, the *Field of blood*. However, he did not long survive his shame: he died, as some afterwards related, by a fall as from a precipice,[5] or, as others related, by hanging himself. The latter narrative,[6] however, is connected

[1] If one takes as a basis simply the quick repentance of Judas Iscariot described Matt. xxvii. 3, one might suppose that he had betrayed the Messiah simply in the good-natured foolish hope that, being thus compelled he would the sooner show himself in his whole power and inaugurate his outward kingdom; comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* pp. 438 sq. However, we have elsewhere no other plain indication of this, and with regard to the account Matt. xxvii. 3, see below.

[2] If, for instance, he received for the betrayal merely thirty silverlings. However, this number is now found mentioned only Matt. xxvi. 15, xxvii. 3–10, and has probably found its way into this special representation of the case from the passage Zech. xi. 13 interpreted as having a Messianic reference.

[3] Acts i. 18, 19.

[4] The name Matt. xxvii. 7, 10 has quite a historical ring: it was perhaps situated outside the gate at which the potters worked, Jer. xviii. 2.

[5] According to the narrative Acts i. 18, 19. This is quite independent of the account in the Gospel of Matt.; but the later, much more horrible tradition, in Papias' fourth book of his *Explanations of the Lord's Sayings* (which has been preserved in the ancient Greek commentators on Matt. xxvii. 7), is similar, whilst in still later authors it has even a more horrible form yet. It is remarkable that a similar death is related of the wicked patriarch *Cain* in the *Book of Jubilees* (see *Jahrbücher der Bibl. Wiss.* ii. p. 241), although this book was undoubtedly written long before the Gospels.

[6] Matt. xxvii. 3–10. It might even be inferred from the τότε, *then*, with which this piece of narrative begins, according to the characteristic manner of the last editor, that the repentance of the traitor followed the same night, and that

with a peculiar view which was likewise formed in the Apostolic age: that is, it was said that as soon as he saw that Christ was really condemned, smitten with compunction, he desired at once to give back the money to the members of the Hagiocracy, and when they would not receive it cast it into the Temple to them and hanged himself. They did not, however, dare to devote it to the Temple treasury, but bought with it that field with the view of assigning it for a strangers' burying-place; in connection with which purpose it is easy to suppose that they dedicated it with the body of this Galilean. Nor can we in fact do otherwise than suppose that the field really served subsequently for such a purpose; whilst the narrative of the immediate repentance of the traitor probably owed its transformed shape to Christian generosity.

But it is impossible not to perceive that the unusually heavy atmosphere in which the spirit of the new Community was now compelled to breathe, and the severe crisis which was destined in these days to befall the entire cause of the perfect true religion, combined to form the second motive which rapidly brought to ripeness the traitor's bad seed. It was now the time when in the Community which had only just been founded everything temporal and eternal, terrestrial and celestial, was destined to be even violently separated, and this young Community to undergo immediately the most trying temptation possible. All hope of an earthly kingdom was about to be torn up by its very roots, the visible head of the Community to be taken away, indeed most deeply dishonoured, and to all human appearance annihilated, the attention to be turned from the palpably present Messiah and directed alone to the celestial one who could possibly come from heaven again. As this danger approached constantly closer, and at last what was wholly unexpected to the ordinary mind really occurred, whoever would still remain faithful in this Community must make his own a view and a hope such as had never before been either familiar or necessary to him.[1] It is indeed true that Christ himself was

he immediately hanged himself, before he had purchased the field, and the death of Christ. However, there is the less reason to understand this narrative as so minutely accurate, as this piece was manifestly inserted by the last narrator at this place merely that it might be received in a suitable connection. In any case the field could have been called *Field of blood* the more naturally if Iscariot had himself actually bought it; and the name *Hakeldamá* itself indicates, by its thoroughly Aramaic form, a recent origin and perhaps a Galilean dialect.

[1] If this is considered, the treason of Judas is thus horrible only in so far as it occurred under the Master's own eyes, but in other respects is far more pardonable than that disloyalty to Christianity which is exhibited *after* it has been most completely shown, by the final consummation of the history of Christ himself, that together with him not the least hope is permissible of acquiring an earthly king-

not in the least surprised by this danger, or even in the least depressed by it in his soul generally: although by no means seeking death and its horrors, and even to the last prepared for any other issue that might be more pleasing to God, we see him still entering upon the most severe and painful tasks in the most exalted mood and blessed composure, and most perfectly perceiving and wisely carrying out everything that had yet to be done on his part. If his attitude towards the great world down to the last moment was such as has been already for the most part described, and we can only in this respect most profoundly admire both all that he did and all that he left undone, we must if possible still more admire him when we carefully note how he, in the gradual approach of this last decision, and finally in it itself, acted towards his disciples as long as he was still able to have free intercourse with them.

The more nearly he saw his earthly end approaching, more and more definitely he uttered in the circle of his disciples his views and hopes regarding the future of the true kingdom of God after his departure from the earth; he uttered them in every form that best suited each particular case, narrating in the most appropriate symbols and didactic stories, and placing clearly in detail before their eyes things that had never been seen by sense though they were nevertheless certain, or presenting them in brief anticipations and pure prophecies; and he added in all cases the right counsel and the truest consolation. If, as we have seen,[1] he had at the right time by parable and direct teaching expounded to his disciples and to the people generally in the noblest manner the fundamental nature, the true commencement and value, and the eternal significance of the kingdom of God, he now completed this entire cycle of prophecy and teaching by the equally true and graphic views and prophecies regarding the nearer and the more distant future of things after his return to the Father. But as in the first case he had sketched the fundamental lines of all true insight into the nature of the perfected kingdom of God only with a view to the immediate practical exercise of his disciples in the corresponding duties, so, in these last days also, he presented none of his numerous conceptions regarding the unfolding of the general future of the kingdom without supplying corresponding counsel or comfort which was involved therein for his disciples.

dom and earthly treasures and advantages. This could really never be so plain to any one previous to the death of Christ as it has since become; and this is the infinitely great lesson and absolute separation from all the past which could previously not be at all so clear to the Twelve even. But on this point see further below.

[1] Pp. 310 sq.

And the copiousness with which he communicated these last great glances and hints to his disciples we are still able to perceive from the precious fragments of the Collected Sayings, which place the exposition of most of them in that time when having left the Temple, on one occasion during these last days, he sat down with the Twelve, opposite its glittering pinnacles, upon the Mount of Olives, meditating and teaching.[1] John omits most of these discourses, because at the time when he wrote a great part of them had already been fulfilled, and there were then many other things of greater importance. Neither for us is this the proper place to enter into a detailed consideration of them, as this belongs rather to the history of the time in which they were of chief importance, the Apostolic age.

But as he now perceived with the greatest clearness the total implacability of his enemies, and that he would not be able to escape their vengeance unless he was prepared to surrender the cause of his Messianic vocation, he had before everything else to consider that he must always be prepared willingly and gladly to resign his life for this cause, should God require it, without any provocation of his own. And in nothing does he appear nobler at last than therein that, although never and in no way seeking death, as from despair, for instance, nor in any way bringing it upon himself by any human fault, but on the contrary, shrinking with human feeling from the pains and horrors of death, he nevertheless, the nearer the bitter necessity approached, submitted himself with the greater composure to the divine will, should this sacrifice also be required of him. It is true, as we have seen,[2] he had been prepared from the beginning of his public career for the most trying issue of it, so far as his own life which had been consecrated to his divine vocation was concerned: but this bitter necessity, in its actual terrors, and as clearly wholly inevitable, had only gradually forced itself more closely upon him. But although he had now since that first bright commencement of his Messianic labours gone through the most various stages of his public activity, he might nevertheless upon the stage which he now occupied have, from a human point of view, still retreated quite easily from his vocation and escaped all danger of death. No fault could be mentioned that rested upon him: and how gladly would the members of the Hagiocracy, if he had only been willing to submit to their wish, have permitted him, even after the betrayal of Judas Iscariot, still to escape, after perhaps a brief

[1] Matt. xxiv., xxv., comp. *Die drei ersten Evang.* pp. 407 sq.

[2] Pp. 240 sq.

imprisonment! But in that case he would not have been Christ, that is, not the leader in the kingdom of the perfect true religion; and if it is in his case inconceivable that even upon the two previous stages of his Messianic labours he ever actually wavered in any of the greatest crises of his life, how much less could he do so now after he had collected around him a Community of the perfect true religion, and had laid in it the immovable foundation of the entire consummation of the kingdom of God, now when the eternal salvation of the souls not only of the Twelve, but of all who at any time and anywhere upon the earth desire this salvation, depended on him more vitally than upon any other historical fact! He now belonged no longer to himself, nor even to God alone; he already belonged wholly to that Community to which he had from the very first devoted himself with his whole immortal being: and he knew what was his higher duty as the head of all seeking after divine salvation and as the true Shepherd of his flock, and could foresee how according to the divine will even his guiltless death might become a means of the final mightiest convulsion of the world of men as it had hitherto been, and the commencement of a complete removal of the guilt of all the hardened and obdurate sins of Israel as well as of the rest of mankind.[1]

But if he possessed this higher resignation and steadfastness, as always before so still more now, in view of the dark lot immediately to befall him, what profound pain must it nevertheless on the other hand cause him to be compelled thus early to leave not only all Israel and the human race, but particularly his twelve Apostles. How much would he have preferred, if he had consulted his human feelings, further to devote to them all his immediate love and care, and how clearly did he know the deep need in which they stood, according to all human appearance, of his immediate presence and ever ready help!

Accordingly during these last days he gave to his Apostles not merely the brightest hope and consolation in the light of his view of all the future,—he also gave to them, as he alone was able, at last himself, with his whole love, yea with his whole life in body and soul, so fully that his outward separation from them could really become his most constant spiritual presence. His entire Messianic life and endeavour had hitherto been really a

[1] As this twofold consideration is already plainly enough expressed in the previous Gospels only in such short sayings as Matt. xii. 39 (xvi. 4 and above, pp. 348 sq.), and xx. 28, xxvi. 12, but is taught on a grander scale and more at length John x. 1–18, xiii. 31–xvii. 26, with unsurpassed truth.

divine surrender of himself, or according to the ancient sacred sacrificial language, a sacrifice of himself, for all who sought his light and salvation, and particularly for those who were most intimately connected with him: and hitherto no mortal had ever made his whole life and action so absolutely as he had already done a sacrifice to the divine will and the eternal welfare of all mankind. But now in the last moments of his visible existence on the earth, when he foresees his approaching fate and best knows how difficult it may be for the perfect true religion to become, even in the circle of those who are most intimate with him, an inalienable possession and constantly a more powerful and influential blessing, he feels the more strongly urged to devote himself to them with his utmost energy, with all his love and all his strength, and as with both body and soul, as if he were driven all the more tenderly and completely to embrace them, to unite them with himself, and wholly lose himself in them the more inevitably the lasting separation threatens; and it is as if he were compelled to leave behind for them as far as he possibly can the best part of himself, just when he feels that he must most and most painfully forsake them. Thus every righteous man might desire to part from the circle of his dear friends: but who must desire more than he to remain nevertheless always fully present with his friends, although visibly for ever separated from them!

When now on the day before the Passover, that is, as we have seen,[1] on the Thursday, the thirteenth of the Easter month, and on the fifth day of his entry into Jerusalem, he observed from all the signs of the time, and particularly from the conduct of Iscariot, which though still undecided could not longer be doubtful to his clear gaze, how near his end was, and was just then alone with the Twelve to take the daily evening meal, he rose suddenly, before the preparations for the supper were finished,[2] laid aside his outer garments like a servant who has something to do in the house, girded himself with a towel like a servant who, in conformity with the custom of those countries, is about to wash his master's feet before a meal after the walking and work of the morning, and took a basin filled with water in order to wash the feet of the Twelve. Nothing

[1] P. 391.

[2] This is implied in the correct reading γινομένου John xiii. 2, instead of γενομένου which Lachmann still reads. The motives of Jesus were, according to vv. 1, 2, two: his knowledge of the time, and that now, as he had always visibly loved his disciples in the world, he would now love them further until the last, and at the last most of all; only this last motive is introduced in the narrative form. *How* he could stoop so low is explained ver. 3: just because he alone occupies so high a position, he could stoop the lowest, as this entire Gospel shows, but no passage in his history more remarkably than this.

would be more likely to arise without premeditation by the quick impulse of a momentary thought than this resolve: but his anticipation that this would be his last meal with them coincided with the boundless love which he had long shown to his disciples, so that the latter tended now suddenly to overflow, and he scarcely knew which of innumerable affectionate things he must do for them. When therefore he will, as is just, begin with Peter, who is gladly acknowledged by himself as chief of the Twelve, this Apostle at first opposes with animation the idea of being served by him whom he himself ought to serve, but eagerly yields when he learns that only as he suffers himself to be thus served by his Lord can he have any part in him and be wholly his: but he desires then earnestly to have his whole body even washed by him, as he exclaims with no less animation, and must now likewise, in the opposite direction, receive the correction, that in the case of those who already at all belong to Christ, such a violent contact and conversion (a complete bath) is no more necessary (as in the case of baptism, as we have seen),[1] but a more gentle perceptible contact and amendment (such as is represented by washing the feet) must suffice.[2] And after he has thus served them all, he explains to them first the higher meaning of this act of love: he had touched them with his own hands and with this contact shown to them more than merely a small earthly service, he had sought, as it were by pressure, to put into them as with his hands his spirit of love, as it were to rub the same into them with the water of the washing; and could one man of feeling amongst them ever forget that his hand had thus, more forcibly than by a kiss and simple laying on of hands, touched and consecrated him? The spiritual meaning of the act transcends therefore its outward and visible significance, and all words are in this case really too weak to express the whole infinity of that meaning. Accordingly he says to them simply that he has thereby given them the example of that genuine love by which alone this his Community has been founded and must be preserved after his visible departure. Not as if such self-sacrificing love, which must always proceed most of all from those in the highest positions, were meant to abolish the differences between the various offices and vocations: the genuine Master remains what he is notwithstanding his condescending and all-embracing

[1] Pp. 168 sq.

[2] Accordingly we have John xiii. 6–10 as elsewhere at first a progressive presentation of the highest truth and then the guarding of this from misconceptions; and ver. 10 is meant merely to guard against misconception, but this is done by reference to another great truth and by an allusion to baptism.

love; and, alas! Christ knows too well that even amongst the Twelve whom he has thus touched, all are not alike in love to him, and indeed that the betrayer already lies in wait amongst them; but nevertheless the blessing of true love remains in all its manifestations, not less the love of the Lord to the servant, of the Master to the disciple, than reversely that of the servant or other recipient to the Lord and Benefactor.[1]

If this meal, the last which Christ could undisturbed partake of with his disciples, as he truly foreboded, began in the way John states with the most touching simplicity in his description of the exalted moment, it is quite intelligible that it should be continued in a similar spirit and ended if possible with a still greater intensification of all the emotions of purest and noblest love as they crowd upon him. It could not be otherwise than that he should himself further now hand to them the bread and wine of this meal, further serving them as a loving friend, but throughout pursuing all the infinite thoughts and sublimest truths which had in this case been suggested, and as it were presenting them in the meal itself, that the disciples might receive them and assimilate them into their entire thought and life. As in view of his death he breaks this bread and hands this wine to them, as if he gave to them therein his own body and his own blood, which is really soon to be shed for them, his desire is that they should have him who is now about to vanish from their sight always in themselves, and keep him always within them as still living and present; *he wills* and desires that it should be so, and they who thus in faith partake of this food which is presented by him really in the material substance receive himself into themselves with his infinite love and strength. Accordingly he is already himself also inwardly as it were another being: after he has thus devoted himself with all that he has still of an earthly nature to his disciples, he has already renounced as it were the whole visible world, and goes now like one who no longer belongs to himself, the more easily and as it were transfigured, to meet his physical death.

There are moments in this fleeting earthly life in which the

[1] In this way the apparently quite isolated utterance attached at the end, John xiii. 20, is explained: and it may be generally remarked that John's language from chap. xii. onwards becomes in this way more concise and brief as it approaches the end, as if it became of itself a reflection of the dreadful history which now presses on most hastily to its conclusion. And especially must we be careful in this most exalted representation not to miss the exalted and divine features, as for instance is plainly done if in ver. 10 there is found an allusion to a simple bath which the disciples, it is supposed, had taken just before. In that case the washing the feet itself immediately afterwards would be inappropriate.

highest experiences, perceptions, and surmises of all humanity are crowded closely together, and everything that the individual has wrought out in all his past endeavours and labours seeks to gather itself up in one word and one symbol, that it may be preserved for ever. Such a moment was this of that last meal of Jesus in relation to that which had been to him during the last year and a half the main object of his earthly labours—the Community of his Friends. Everything in this moment of unique character transacted between Christ and his disciples transcends infinitely its immediate object, and all the earthly material is in this case transfigured into the purest spiritual reality. For the infinite things which sought to become naturalised upon earth in an abiding Community through Christ's most perfect work and his purest strongest love had now long been supplied: they waited only as it were for this moment to be as overpoweringly and as vividly as possible transfigured and glorified in it for this Community, and thus found in the humblest and most insignificant thing the proper instrument of their plainest expression and their immortal truth; for even in the smallest, and to sense apparently the most insignificant thing, the loftiest meaning can be expressed.

But undoubtedly all this necessarily could not receive its highest significance before the Apostolic age. That Community to which he had thus devoted himself in his last moments, the more frequently and the more lovingly it subsequently recalled these moments, could regard nothing as more consoling than the recollection of them, and nothing as more sacred than to repeat as far as it could what had then first taken shape in creative originality. But of the proceedings of Christ's manifestation of his love on this day the only one which could be repeated was the meal: for the disciples had themselves partaken of it, and the celestial One could always subsequently be thought of as fully present at it with his spirit; whilst the washing of the feet, as something in which the disciples had been purely receptive, and which was intended to communicate the love of the Lord as with his own hands, admitted in no way of repetition. The celebration of the meal admitted of repetition, and we shall see below that in the Apostolic time several other things of expressive symbolic meaning were readily connected with this celebration: but undoubtedly many Christians were accustomed very early to repeat the celebration of the Lord's Supper annually on the day of the Passover itself instead of on the day before it, or the day before the 14th of the ancient Easter month, and to connect it with the Passover

itself, for reasons which can likewise be better considered below. This new custom which tended to become prevalent, and still more the manner of regarding the nature of the death of Christ which more and more obtained, reacted then even upon the usual re-narration of the Gospel history. For after it had become quite customary to call Christ himself the Christian Passover lamb slain as a sacrifice,[1] inasmuch as his death had really happened as near as possible to the time of the Passover, and the first Christians saw therein a confirmation of many of the truths dearest to them, the account of the first celebration of this meal readily took a form as if Christ had really kept it with them as a Passover supper, and had only at last further handed to his disciples bread and wine in the new higher significance. This form of the account, in accordance with which many details in the special narrative then took characteristic forms, is now presented to us in the first three Gospels according to their predominant way of regarding the meal;[2] and a further consequence of it was that the 15th of this month, or the first great day of the feast, had to be regarded as the proper day of the crucifixion and death of Christ.

However, as is generally the case with such small derangements, the original reminiscence has really not been completely put out by this derangement, and permits itself to be recognised again beneath the surface with considerable correctness even in its condition of disturbance. For if that meal had really been a Passover, Christ would have presented to his disciples as the most expressive symbol of his body, which was then devoted to death, particularly some of the flesh of the lamb also, especially if this meal of love had been quite identical with the Passover, as we should have to suppose from Luke's account:[3] but it is always bread and wine only that are spoken of. Further, according to well-known laws,[4] which the members of the Hagiocracy of that time least of all could violate, the arrest and condemnation could not have taken place between the night of the Passover and the morning of the first great day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. And as the day of his death was according to this form of the account also a Friday,[5] it after all so far (supposing that it was still clearly remembered

[1] According to 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, and many other related passages.

[2] The general view which must be taken of the accounts has been further discussed in *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 424 sq.

[3] Luke xxii. 14–20: on the contrary according to the earlier account, Mark xiv. 22–25, Matt. xxvi. 26–29, the strictly sacred part of the meal did not begin before towards its end.

[4] See *Antiquities*, p. 313.

[5] See below.

that in that year the Sunday was the third day from that of the crucifixion) really harmonises with the more exact history.[1] Moreover, this form of the account never really represents by any other indications even the night of the arrest and the following day of his death as the time of the great day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread;[2] but on the contrary still suggests clearly enough, by the observation that the representatives of the Hagiocracy feared above everything his sentence and execution on the feast day,[3] the original reminiscence of the actual day. But it is in this case also John who first, in the most perfectly simple narrative of his book, restores the entire chronology of the event to its original purity. And if he relates only the washing of the feet, which had been passed over in the earlier form of the account, and not the presentation of the bread and wine, he did so partly because the latter was known to everybody (which accords with his general habit of passing over so much that was universally known) and partly because he had at an earlier place already so definitely explained the higher meaning of such an eating of Christ's bread and of Christ's flesh and blood,[4] that it was for him quite superfluous once more to revert to it in this connection.

However, the discrepancy amongst the Gospels regarding the time of this supper is, according to another consideration bearing upon the case, of comparative insignificance. When examined more closely, that is, the whole form of the account according to which the evening of the betrayal and the supper was the evening of the Passover, as it is found further carried out in the first three Gospels, dates back originally only to the Gospel of Mark. But in Luke[5] there has been preserved the

[1] This is in fact of itself decisive: and it will be further shown below (vol. vi. [German]) how certainly the day of the crucifixion was removed from that Sunday of unparalleled significance simply by the complete Saturday. Further comp. *Jahrbücher d. B. W.* vii. pp. 166 sq., and on subsequent treatments of the question the longer critiques *ibid.* xi. pp. 253–260.

[2] This appears everywhere in the three first Gospels, as well as 1 Cor. xi. 23.

[3] Mark xiv. 2, Matt. xxvi. 5; comp. above, p. 391. The original meaning can have been no other than that they had feared his condemnation and execution *in the midst of the feast*, when the populace, as having nothing to do, was the more ready to begin disturbances; that they desired accordingly to postpone his arrest and death till after the feast (and that was obviously their first purpose before the betrayal came to their assistance), or to carry out their dark designs completely before the feast, in order that they might be at the feast itself an accomplished fact, and the assembled people could not attempt to deliver from prison or otherwise take the part of one who had only just been arrested. And in fact the event proved in their favour.—It is therefore unnecessary, or rather unallowable, to suppose that Christ intentionally anticipated the Passover by a day, as was probably permitted in the case of the feast of *Pûrîm*, according to *Mishna* Megilla, i. 1, 2.

[4] Pp 341 sq.

[5] Luke xxii. 7, 8: the words are here quite different from Mark xiv. 12, Matt. xxvi. 17.

beginning of a much more simple account, according to which Christ, *when the day*, that is the feast, *of Unleavened Bread came when the Passover must be sacrificed, sent Peter and John into the city* to make preparations for it. This is so related that the day before the Passover can also be supposed to be meant, particularly as the preparations had surely to be made in due time. In that case the meal which was taken on the same day in the room thus provided, would it is true not have been the Passover, but still could have been partaken of quite in the feeling of its nearness; and could the more easily be regarded as occupying its place, as undoubtedly the disciples on the following day, with their shocked feelings and extreme alarm, could find neither a place nor feel a desire to partake of it. But in any case the Passover really played an important part in the history of those two days, a fact which John does not mention any more in his Gospel because everything merely Judean had become a matter of indifference to him.

This must suffice with regard to the more exact date of this decisive moment. But in the development of the general history the chief thing is ultimately this—that Christ had thus done on his part everything that he could in order that the fatal blow foreseen by him might not fall upon the Twelve unprepared, and that they might at least afterwards, when they recovered somewhat from the stupefaction of this blow, find comfort in the eternal truths to establish which was the sole purpose of his mission. Still the nearer the blow approached the more terrible did it appear in its foretokens. According to the general reminiscence of the Gospels, all the Twelve held their peace as soon as Jesus once alluded more definitely to it,[1] and even those who were at other times strongest in faith could not understand this prospect;[2] just as it will soon appear further that even Peter wavered here for a moment. That which was now about to happen, and Christ foretold to them with increasing definiteness, was opposed to all the first and surest hopes of the Messiah, as even the people generally quickly perceived this from all the past Messianic views:[3] how must those in this case be most profoundly moved, and as it were thrown off their guard, the entire hope of whose lives had become inseparably identified with the Messianic hope! It is in fact one

[1] Mark ix. 32, x. 32, and the other related passages; John xvi. 4–6, 20, 22, 32.

[2] Mark viii. 31–33, with the related passages. Nor does John's Gospel give a syllable of contradiction to this.

[3] As John at last, xii. 34, very properly mentions: whilst the other Gospels presuppose this prevalent popular view as not requiring remark.

of the greatest proofs of the absolute goodness and truth of the entire cause of Jesus, that notwithstanding the greatest spiritual freedom and intelligence to which he had himself educated the Twelve, in this hour of terrible trial the decision of the one Iscariot only was on the wrong side, whilst Jesus had neither excited in them any false prospect of the possessions and honours of this world nor any perverted national hope. But it is nevertheless undeniable that this great general uncertainty of the situation at that time, and the want of clearness, from which the rest of the Twelve suffered only less than Iscariot inasmuch as they were better protected by their higher faith and their greater innocence in general, became for him one of the causes which led him to his horrible deed. Just as it may generally be observed that it is always not so much one cause, however influential it may be, but rather the confusion and collision of the most various evil thoughts, which in the end misleads a man to carry out an evil deed that has long been ripening in his soul.

2. *His arrest and its consequences.*

According to all the accounts Iscariot was still present at the last meal. And he did not appear to observe the fact when Christ both before, and then again during the meal, repeatedly alluded to perfidy even in the midst of the Twelve themselves.[1] When towards the end of the meal, after the boundless proofs of love which the Master had once more given to them all, Judas still remained silent, Christ felt, being amazed at so much obduracy, that such an oppressive and gloomy condition of indecision ought not to continue. Accordingly he openly declared that one of them would betray him: all the Twelve, Judas from embarrassment and surprise, the rest from honest sincerity, were most deeply concerned, and protested with greatest animation the impossibility of such a thing. But as Christ did not withdraw his assertion, Peter desiring to obtain from him, through John his bosom-disciple, a more particular explanation, went to this Apostle and privately expressed to him his wish. John, sitting on this occasion as usual nearest

[1] According to John xiii. 10, 18, 19 and other passages. On the other hand, the earlier account makes Jesus utter the plain word about the betrayal somewhat too soon, Mark xiv. 18–21; a representation of the case the precision of which is made even still more pointed by the last author of the present Gospel of Matt. xxvi. 21–25. John's narrative is incontestably in this respect also more accurate: it is, however, in this special instance remarkable that Luke also, xxii. 21–23, probably correctly felt what was incongruous in the ordinary narrative, and on that account gave a more appropriate order of succession to the events.

to Christ, ventured likewise privately to ask who was intended, and received as an answer, that he it was to whom he was just presenting a morsel[1] (as in addition and from special attention and regard). Undoubtedly if the unhappy Iscariot had not distinctly heard this which passed privately between John and Christ (and is communicated to us only by John in his Gospel), still less had the others; and it is natural to suppose that John hardly communicated it to Peter at once. He would feel that it was perhaps still possible that Judas should come to a better mind, as Jesus had as it were heaped upon him so much love: but he was really conscious of being unworthy of so much love, and inferred from the unusual special distinction, simply that Jesus must have already perfectly seen into his very heart; and as Jesus now added aloud that he had better do what he intended quickly, he rushed at once from the company, feeling still more strongly what Jesus must have intended by the remark, firmly resolved immediately to execute his purpose inasmuch as he had in any case been already seen through by Jesus. In reality it was only one who was self-condemned who could forebode anything evil even in this last utterance of Jesus: for inasmuch as he, as steward of the society, had always various matters to do for it, particularly now at the approach of the Passover, Christ might have intended such perfectly natural occupations; as in fact the rest thus understood him.

We do not know precisely how much time elapsed between this departure of Iscariot and his return at the arrest: undoubtedly some hours; and as we know from John that it was already night when he went out,[2] the arrest may not have followed before towards midnight. The earlier narrative, which regards the meal as the Passover, reported with considerable brevity what Jesus further said and experienced in these last moments of his being alone with his Apostles subsequent to the supper and the Psalm which closed the celebration of the Passover. This night also they went to the Mount of Olives, to sleep there according to their custom: on the way Christ did not hide from them how certainly he foresaw that soon they would all take offence at his fate. As Peter thought to except himself at all events, he who knew him better foretold to him that it was just he who would that night three times deny him

[1] According to well-known custom which is still met with at entertainments in those countries.

[2] John xiii. 30, 31, where we must read, although only according to Cod. U., ἦν δὲ νὺξ ὅτε ἐξῆλθεν. λέγει οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς When and where Iscariot left the company is not clear from the earlier narrative.

before the cock crew.[1] Nevertheless Peter, like the rest, would not admit such a possibility. When they had arrived in the garden of Gethsemane, on the western slope of Olivet, he left the rest somewhat behind and went higher up with the three most intimate of the Twelve only, in order that he might be at last somewhat more alone, and in this final crisis find further ultimate serenity and strength in God: so he went somewhat further aside from these three also, and desired simply that they would watch with him this night, as he was feeling the approach of death. As he therefore now anticipated the completion of the betrayal only too certainly as close at hand, the human dread of death once more seized him: all his human feelings were still unweakened, strong and healthy; and if the anticipation of death can for moments overwhelm every healthy soul, what pains and bitter sufferings must he feel would come with his death upon his disciples likewise! Was there no possibility that the Messianic cause should triumph in another way? The thought of this might, and indeed must, if his human feelings still remained pure and natural, once more force itself upon him in this last moment when he collected himself alone in the presence of God: but only to permit him at once to find afresh and more absolutely in God the true submission to His higher will. But whilst he thus strengthened himself with agonising audible prayer for the last hour, resisting every motion of human weakness and temptation, he had in vain wished that the three would at least resist the power of sleep; he finds them, to be sure, after the intense excitement of the last days and hours, three times asleep, and must deny himself even this human hope of finding at least his most intimate Apostles watching about him. He must, then, at last, thus quite alone, and as it were forsaken by all the world, meet the preluding pangs of death, how much more the death-pangs themselves when they came! Even those who are nearest and most faithful to him cannot help him, not even so much as with their spirit: and if as a man he naturally desired at least to strengthen his own spirit by their watchful spirit, he is compelled at the right moment to resign also this last human hope.

In this earlier simple form of narrative some of the most

[1] Thus without the addition 'crow *twice*,' the expression is undoubtedly most authentic, although the addition is already found in the earlier narrative Mark xiv. 30; it is evidently a more correct reminiscence and a correction of the earlier form of narrative when the word 'twice' is omitted in the later Gospels, and also John xiii. 38.

important reminiscences of those moments of agitated decision have undoubtedly been faithfully preserved: the narrative is brief and incomplete, since Christ could in these last hours of his freedom without doubt say much more that was worthy of being remembered: still it supplies by a few striking outlines the distinct picture of the significance of such last memorable hours. As however the history of the last events of Christ's earthly life was in general early traced (as the Gospels themselves show) with special interest, and variously added to and reproduced, this is also the case with the recollection of these last hours before his arrest; and the representation of the occurrences of those hours became naturally more and more exalted in conformity with their elevation. We perceive this in various ways in Luke. On the one hand, that is, many of the weightiest words and conversations of Christ were placed in these last hours, as many of them as seemed appropriate to them: then the period subsequent to the last meal and before the departure for the last walk to Olivet was gradually lengthened, as this meal in fact necessarily presented most abundant matter for further solemn farewell conversations. Thus Luke introduces at this point an important piece from the Collected Sayings and two others from the Book of the Higher Gospel History.[1] On the other hand the representation of Christ engaged in his mental conflict stimulated not a little the continuous endeavour to describe it in a way more adequate to its great elevation: of this also some great outlines have been preserved by Luke from the same somewhat late Gospel work.[2]

But in this respect John goes much further. As in his Gospel generally he seeks to treat with completeness and fully exhaust at the most suitable place every important matter of more universal significance, so he connects with this moment, when Christ is at last after the departure of the betrayer once more alone with those who are quite faithful to him, the most eloquent as well as the most complete exposition of the entire relation between him and his followers. This is the most delicate and tender relation that can be illustrated in a Gospel, and constitutes at the same time the highest subject-matter of

[1] Luke xxii. 21–38; see thereon *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 428 [on the *Book of the Higher Gospel History*, see *ibid.* pp. 79–81, and Translator's Preface above].

[2] Luke xxii. 43, 44, see *ibid.* pp. 432 sq. It is evident also that the author of the Epistle to the Romans, v. 7–9, was indebted to a peculiarly vivid narrative of that moment; undoubtedly that was one of the later Gospels, only that we are now no longer in a position to say exactly which; perhaps that of the *Higher Gospel History*.

all true religion: but nowhere is the whole range of these truths illustrated with such marvellous profundity and such perfect adequacy as in this chief passage of that work which is the most absolutely spiritual of all the books of the Bible. It is true, as needs hardly be remarked, that in this longest discourse of Christ the same freedom in reproduction and special reconstruction prevails which is characteristic of such discourses in this Gospel, and without which this discourse could not have been produced at all with such sublimity of thought and such an exhaustive treatment of the matter in all its aspects; it is also in this case, as in similar discourses of this Gospel, impossible not to perceive that John takes as his basis certain fundamental utterances of previous Gospels and reverts to them again,[1] in some such way as a great musician who, by means of the freest yet most appropriate and enchanting variations, transforms and raises to their highest power the few fundamental sounds which have been supplied to him. However, with the elevation of this special theme the manner of presenting it rises here more wonderfully than in any other long discourse. And the fundamental thought of this great discourse, which simply grows in inward clearness and outward warmth by means of certain intercalated remarks and objections, is it is true simply that which makes itself felt elsewhere so powerfully in this Gospel—that the profoundest humiliation of Christ, as it now after the departure of the betrayer immediately and unavoidably awaits him, will be precisely his highest glorification. But in that the speaker considers, on the basis both of this thought and of the great Christian chief command of love, his relation to his followers and to God in every aspect of it, as it had hitherto existed and must soon be consummated by the last great change, he expounds in the first instance what *he* on the one hand is about to do for his followers, and then on the other hand what it is *their* duty to do in return.

His duty, if we may so say, is not to forsake them even on and after his departure from the visible world, but to prepare

[1] Thus the utterance John xiii. 38 is simply reproduced from Mark xiv. 30, the phrase at the close of the first part xiv. 31 from Mark xiv. 42, the saying at the end of the second part xvi. 32 from Mark xiv. 27; and the same could easily be shown to hold in further instances. But it is more important to observe that John in this case also presupposes such Gospel writings as have not been preserved; the utterance xiv. 2, 3, which must be regarded as merely parenthetical according to the correct reading ἐάν without καί, that is, thus: *In the house of my Father are many homes (but if not, should I then have said to you 'I go to prepare a place for you'?): when I go and prepare a place for you, &c.*, can only be understood as an involuntary reference to an earlier utterance, which, however, has not occurred previously in this Gospel. Similarly the words xi. 2, comp. xii. 3, at least by their form, presuppose a book, now unknown to us, in which this Mary was mentioned.

for them a place with the Father for the eternal blessedness, and to reappear from thence whilst they are still upon the earth, either himself or by the mission of the Holy Spirit.[1] Their duty, on the other hand, is to maintain towards him, as one who desires to be not so much their lord as their friend amid all the temptations and calamities of the world, that faithfulness which it appears so difficult to maintain, and yet is really so easy for everyone who fully knows and has received into himself with heavenly clearness *his* mind.[2] Yet inasmuch as everything that Christ in such a parting hour anticipates and desires regarding his own glorification as well as that of his disciples, if they maintain their faithfulness, can only be accomplished by the Father Himself, the discourse at last is of itself transformed into an audible[3] fervent prayer, which once more most distinctly gathering up all the highest things that have been said, still involuntarily lingers again most at the intercession for his disciples, but at last includes beyond the narrow circle of the Twelve all the countless numbers which come through them, and in a similar way, to the knowledge of the true God. With this prayer the principal matter of those words also, which Christ, according to the earlier narratives, uttered on the way and in the garden, has been exhausted in conformity with the general meaning of this last great concluding discourse and of this sublime farewell of Christ as he is about to vanish from the visible world. After this discourse, which was delivered at the close of that meal itself while he was still in the town, John therefore passes over entirely the accounts of Christ's subsequent stay in the garden; and the agony which there overtakes him, according to the earlier Gospels, would be besides scarcely possible to be conceived after the absolute sublimity of this valedictory discourse. It must, precisely in this instance most of all, appear how fully John casts aside every earthly element in the infinity

[1] This thought simply is shown throughout the most various stages John xiii. 31–xiv. 31, and here the discourse soars continually higher through all possible intervals, so that when it has arrived at its height, xiv. 31, it suddenly stops, and Christ will therefore depart; after which, turning to the other aspect of the matter, it flows on more calmly after a new commencement, xv. 1, 2. Further, this first half of the discourse falls into the following parts, which may be here briefly indicated:—(1) xiii. 31–35; 36–xiv. 4; vv. 5–7; vv. 8–11;—(2) xiv. 12–21; vv. 22–24; vv. 25–31.

[2] This second half, chaps. xv. xvi., falls likewise into the following parts:—(1) xv. 1—xvi. 16, vv. 17–24;—(2) vv. 25–28; vv. 29–33; but in as far as it gradually stoops from that elevation until it finds its calm conclusion after the complete satisfaction of the disciples, its course is really in detail dissimilar.

[3] It is implied by the whole connection, and follows especially from v. 13, comp. xvi. 24, that the prayer, ch. xvii., is intended to be considered as uttered aloud in the presence of the listening disciples.

of the purely celestial matter which is here presented in abundance: besides, he had already somewhat earlier seized an opportunity to represent how at least the passing thought of another issue might cross the mind of Christ.[1]

Meanwhile, on the part of his enemies everything had already been prepared for taking him prisoner during this very night at the spot where he was supposed to be according to the traitor's instructions. The representatives of the Hagiocracy had sent with the traitor both Roman soldiers, belonging to the garrison in Jerusalem, and a company belonging to the high priest's temple-guard, under the lead of a certain Malchus:[2] this large company was well armed, and, in order not to miss in a possible hiding-place the man they sought, well supplied with torches and lanterns. As now preparation had been made for resistance, Iscariot condescended to be employed as the instrument of an artifice: he was obliged, when they had arrived in the garden, first to seek Jesus alone, going before the soldiers, in order thus to point him out to the leader of the company. The traitor had the insolence not merely to seek him, but also to greet and to kiss him in the most friendly manner as if everything were between them as before, but only thereby to give the sign which had been arranged between him and the soldiers: with a brief, earnest word Christ repulsed his hypocrisy;[3] on the other hand now went himself to meet the armed band openly and quite alone, with the inquiry Whom seek ye? and at once declared who he was. So much boldness had not been expected by the bailiffs of the high priest: it was suddenly as if an unknown dread prevented their arresting that man who had come to meet them from the midst of his attendants, quite alone, with the open brow of innocence; they sank as it were to the ground.[4] He may also

[1] For it is quite evident that the words John xii. 27 (see *ante*, p. 403) are intended to be exactly equivalent to those Mark xiv. 35. They are therefore, together with the dread of death generally, felt at least for a moment, intentionally placed somewhat earlier by John, as if they did not suit so well the last hour. A similar moment of agitation, transitory as a flash of lightning, John places nevertheless in that moment when Christ must openly refer to the betrayal, xiii. 21. Thus, in John's case, the materials take everywhere a somewhat freer form.

[2] We are indebted to the account of John, which is in many details more exact, for our knowledge of this name, and of the fact that Roman soldiers also were present, xviii. 3, 10, 26. However, the earlier and this later narrative naturally explain each other mutually most satisfactorily.

[3] With the words which are now found only Matt. xxvi. 50; which, however, are perfectly appropriate here, and may be derived from the original narrative.

[4] What John narrates xviii. 6, although in brief words, is perfectly intelligible if, as may be done without difficulty, the words of Jesus, which are in the earlier narrative, Mark xiv. 48, 49, simply placed a little too late, are transferred to this moment. It was in every respect worthy of him to utter such words, and at the right time: soldiers and guards

in this moment have uttered to them the earnest word, which the earlier narrative has preserved, that they ought at least first to know what they sought to do; that they had come out as against a robber with swords and staves, in order to take in the darkness of the night one whom they might have taken much more easily daily as he taught in the Temple. But he had no desire to escape them: so he called upon them himself to take him according to the command of their superiors, but to permit his attendants to go their way. The last point could not for the present be unacceptable to those who had sent the soldiers, as it was evidently thought still possible to crush the entire matter by the destruction of this one man. When now they proceeded actually to lay hands upon him, Peter was suddenly too much roused thereby to remain passive: he drew his sword and cut off the right ear of Malchus;[1] but a reproving word of the Lord checked his untimely and improper zeal. But when Christ now suffered himself quite passively to be taken and completely bound, amazement and fear at what was after all not thus expected by them seized the Twelve and the remaining adherents, who had probably first come up with the soldiers: they fled in all directions; and if on the one hand John properly mentions how truly the glory of Christ was therein also evinced, that, just as he had wished and foretold, none of his own came to harm while he was present with them on earth,[2] on the other hand the earlier narrative mentions that only one young man (whose name is not given), who had come up, almost naked as he was when roused from his sleep, to defend Christ, at first faithfully followed him as if to give an alarm and to call all to his protection, but at last likewise fled when the attempt was made to arrest him.[3]

ought also to know what they do, and for what purpose they are being used.

[1] The detailed narrative that Jesus immediately healed this ear, which is not found either in the earlier narrative or in that of John, is undoubtedly connected in the case of Luke xxii. 51 with a narrative concerning this resort to the sword related generally more at length, and which he found in the Book of the Higher Gospel History after vv. 35–38, but did not adopt in its completeness.

[2] John xviii. 9, with a backward reference to xvii. 12. The emphasis which John lays upon the fact that, just as he had always wished, none given to him came to harm whilst under his visible guard, is in fact quite intelligible, and the thing itself is by no means unimportant. By his means not *one* even suffered harm; it was he himself who suffered quite alone: who can in this respect either be compared with him? It is true Socrates fell alone; but his cause, as we know, was in no sense that of the people as that of Christ was.

[3] Already omitted by Matt., as then Luke and John mentioned nothing of the flight of the disciples, although this is implied as certain by the utterance John xvi. 32. And undoubtedly this disciple was a man well known subsequently also, whose name the narrative simply considers it unnecessary to supply here: comp. what has to be said on this point vol. vi. [German.]

The first stratagem of the enemies had proved by the help of the traitor successful almost beyond expectation: the following ones were not long delayed.

His trial and sentence to death.

For in the camp of his enemies everything required to secure a speedy condemnation had evidently been meanwhile carefully arranged, inasmuch as the greatest expedition was used, in order to prevent popular commotions, to get Jesus executed as quickly as possible, and indeed early the next morning, before the evening of the Passover and the proper Easter feast should interrupt the proceedings of the court and unite the masses of the people. It had long been known that the populace in Jerusalem, which was generally so easy to move, was never more inclined to make commotions and to give the government bolder signs of its discontent, than when on the feast days, protected as it were by the Law, it was collected in large numbers.

His trial had necessarily to pass through two stages, as the Roman Governor was required, as we have seen,[1] to give, after his personal examination of the case, his sanction to a sentence of death which had been agreed upon by the Sanhedrîn: the accidental presencé of Pilate at that time in Jerusalem itself accelerated, however, this necessary procedure. But the actual trial in the Sanhedrîn had further to be preceded by a preliminary hearing of the case in which the fact of the accusation had to be stated, and which was in so far of greatest importance. It was natural that a case could not be brought immediately before the highest court: but as the accusation in the case of Jesus sought to establish a crime worthy of death in respect of purely religious and political matters, the very first hearing had to be taken by the highest judge. The reminiscence of two courts had, it is true, been preserved in the earlier narrative also, but not distinctly:[2] in this case also it is John who more accurately states all the details. While the earlier narrative makes Caiaphas, the proper high priest at that time, hold the first hearing, which is of itself improbable, inasmuch as the officiating high priest had only the chief conduct of all the magisterial courts and acted as president only in the Sanhedrîn, John mentions that Jesus

[1] P. 39.

[2] Mark xiv. 53–55 and on the contrary xv. 1 (repeated in Matt.); in fact Luke xxii. 54 compared with v. 66 already speaks somewhat more clearly, but unfortunately he omits the entire hearing in the night.

was first taken to Annas and examined by him, then after he had declared him guilty he was afresh bound and sent to Caiaphas and thereby to the Sanhedrîn, in order that the latter might pronounce sentence of death and send him to the Roman Governor.[1] If we now suppose, as naturally follows from this, that Annas was as a member of the Sanhedrîn at the same time the chief examining judge,[2] to which office he may have been raised as formerly high priest and father-in-law of Caiaphas,[3] then the whole course of procedure becomes quite intelligible.

For the representatives of the Hagiocracy plainly sought to conduct the judicial proceedings, it is true, quite according to the requirements of the law: but with regard to justice in the higher sense, they concerned themselves only too little. If we inquire more particularly what law it was according to which they really sought to judge and condemn Jesus, it is quite evident that, supposing him to have been innocent of any civil crime, there existed no written law whatever which they could have used against him. The case that some one should claim to be the Messiah, whether in making the claim he had in view chiefly celestial or terrestrial objects, the ancient sacred Law had not at all provided against, and, indeed, could not have provided against, inasmuch as it had then never occurred. Conscientious judges would therefore have felt compelled to fully acquit Jesus, supposing that he had, perhaps under the claim of being the Messiah, done nothing unlawful according to the common law, which no one accused him of; and the violations of the Sabbath which, as we have seen,[4] were previously often laid against him, supposing even that he was not able wholly to vindicate his conduct in regard to them,

[1] John xviii. 13, 14, and v. 24, where undoubtedly οὖν must with the best MSS. be inserted after ἀπέστειλε; if the words vv. 13, 24, 28 are carefully compared, there can be no doubt as to John's meaning. It is true his narrative is here, as so often, somewhat brief and compressed, still he leaves out only what could be easily understood, namely, that the Sanhedrîn first assembled when he was brought to the proper high priest Caiaphas vv. 24, 28, and that the sentence of death, to be handed in writing to Pilate, was first passed in the Sanhedrîn. As regards the meaning of the words vv. 25–27, see below.

[2] Or, to use the Rabbinic terminology, אב (אבי) בית דין. [Comp. *ante*, pp. 14, 16.]

[3] When John xviii. 13 mentions as the reason why Christ was *first* led to Annas and not to Caiaphas simply that he was father-in-law of the latter, it follows from the nature of the case that the reason was not in this way completely given, that it must therefore be further supplied to the extent to which the rest of it is merely indicated. It may be further remarked that these two 'high priests' (for John thus names Annas also v. 15–23), were, according to Luke iii. 2, mentioned together elsewhere in the ordinary Gospel history, and in that case the elder first, inasmuch as they had become memorable in this association through the history of Christ's death.

[4] Pp. 291 sq., pp. 373 sq.

were not sufficient, according to the custom of the time, to found a capital charge upon.[1] They were therefore reasons lying quite outside the sacred Law and the true religion, and, indeed, outside all then existing laws, which induced the representatives of the Hagiocracy to insist upon the punishment of death, even should no really legal pretext be found against him. It was the oppressive feeling that there was rising in this case a spiritual power, which, if it should further develop and progress, must destroy their own power together with the Hagiocracy. O fools, who simply to find peace for the moment destroyed the purest and divinest thing possible, and thereby only brought about all the more quickly and irremediably the ruin of their own cause! If they determined therefore to know nothing of Christ the closer he came to them, and opposed him with growing infatuation, as they had hitherto done with increasing obduracy, there remained nothing for them, in case they discovered nothing unlawful that they could lay hold of against him, but amongst themselves and before the people subject to them an unreasoning horror at the assumption of this man, who put himself above all past sacred laws and made himself equal to God, while before the Romans they could only pretend to feel great alarm at the popular disturbances which this 'king' would occasion, thereby hypocritically exhibiting great devotion to the Imperial Roman government. Indeed, for an unusually clever politician, such as the high priest of that time was, who desired above all things not to risk losing the friendship of Rome, and who considered himself especially astute amongst these representatives of the Hagiocracy, the last-named reason was of itself sufficient.[2] The issue of this trial, which was gone through merely to save appearances, was therefore easy to foresee:[3] and undoubtedly Christ himself foresaw it as plainly as possible. Yet it was his duty in these last transactions also to maintain his dignity.

The hearing before Annas undoubtedly took place late in the evening of the same day, in order that the case might be laid before the Sanhedrîn as early as possible the next morning in a form ready for judgment. This ex-high priest questioned Jesus in the first instance about his disciples and his teaching: with regard to the first he had no conceivable right to inquire,

[1] The ancient laws on this point (*Antiquities*, pp. 104 sq.) had undoubtedly been then long softened down.

[2] See *ante*, pp. 373 sq.

[3] It is amazing that educated Jews (to say nothing of unworthy Christians) can in our day continue to misunderstand all this and find the 'Trial of Jesus' quite proper and regular. In this sense everything may be considered 'regular!' But the truth cannot, in our time either, be thereby put out of court, in spite of all these vain Jewish endeavours. Comp. now the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1866, pp. 399 sq.

so long as the accused had so far not been tried as a misleader of the people: accordingly Jesus made answer to the second question only, but briefly in such a way as was alone becoming in him to answer, namely, that his teaching had long been publicly known. It is only too probable that thus early that blow upon the cheek of which John speaks[1] was given by an over-zealous servant of the court for supposed insolent speech in court. But as the judge did not succeed in entangling him in his own words, he had the witnesses who were already at hand brought forward: who may at once, with one of the Gospels,[2] be just as well called false, inasmuch as they had been placed there with the malicious purpose of stating something which could be laid hold of which they were supposed to have heard from Christ, and were nevertheless unable to say really anything against him; moreover it appeared on closer examination that no two of them perfectly agreed together. The thing which seemed most doubtful was still the utterance regarding the destruction of the Temple which was now revived from the time of his earliest public labours,[3] and which nevertheless not even two who alleged it knew how to produce with such agreement that a judicial condemnation could have been based upon their evidence. As now Christ simply held his peace with reference to all these witnesses, the ex-high priest began to lose his patience, rebuked him for his silence, and asked him on his oath (for no other resource now remained to him), whether he really considered himself 'the Messiah the Son of God.' But scarcely had Jesus, as he was obliged to do, solemnly affirmed this, when the examining judge supposed that he had thereby condemned himself. We are not told upon what passage of the Law he founded his condemnation: probably upon one in Deuteronomy directed against false prophets;[4] for the officers of the court mocked him now as a false prophet, and they set about binding him afresh as one already convicted, to send him to the Sanhedrîn for the final sentence.

During these proceedings of some length two of the most intimate disciples, having recovered from their first fear, found their way to the same house where the hearing took place,

[1] John xviii. 19–23: that John then omits the whole of the further transaction in this court, can have no other ground than that he presupposes it as known from the earlier accounts.

[2] At all events Matt. put this feature much more prominently forward than Mark: while Luke omits the whole transaction with the witnesses, but evidently only for the sake of brevity.

[3] See pp. 257 sq.

[4] It is in fact almost a matter of indifference which of the two passages that are here possible, Deut. xiii. 1–6 or xviii. 20–22, as really neither of them was perfectly appropriate; the judge could just as well take the two together.

following at a distance the company which had led away their beloved Master. The earlier narrative relates this only of Peter, but really simply in order not to leave unmentioned how in these terrible hours, standing about the court, and warming himself in the cold night with the watchmen and servants at a great fire kindled in the yard, he had not answered the question, whether *he* also belonged to the following of the accused, with Yes! Undoubtedly the much-tried Apostle himself subsequently related very often how then from fear of man he had failed to openly enough confess his Master, full of bitter repentance even at a transgression seemingly so small in such a terrible time; and only on that account did this reminiscence find its way into the Gospel history. But John in his narrative informs us how it was possible that Peter should obtain entrance into the carefully guarded court of that great house: John himself was admitted as known in the house,[1] and on his application Peter also obtained admittance. Thus it is also explained how it could be asked whether he *also* belonged to the adherents of Jesus; and as the acknowledged head of the Twelve he had undoubtedly most to fear.

The Sanhedrîn, as more difficult to call together, on its part did not assemble before the early morning: yet its sitting was this time got through undoubtedly with great haste,[2] and the transactions could there be quite brief if Christ, as was the fact, did not recant. Accordingly he was led while it was still quite early to Pilate, who was already, according to Roman custom, present for business before sunrise in the Prætorium,[3] to receive from him the confirmation of the sentence of death which had now been passed in due form by the highest court: but at the same time it was evidently desired in the message to Pilate that he should let him be crucified according to Roman practice as a rebel who had attacked the Emperor's authority. For the ancient national manner of executing a false prophet

[1] *How* has been shown above, p. 186.

[2] The ἐπὶ τὸ πρωΐ, Mark xv. 1, similarly repeated by Matthew and Luke, denotes (comp. John xx. 1) a time considerably before the sunrise at that season of the year: and generally in those countries business is naturally commenced earlier in the day in proportion as the hot mid-day occasions a longer pause; but this could be particularly the custom there during the Roman rule. When John, xviii. 28, indicates similarly the time when Jesus was brought before Pilate, it must be remembered that the transactions in the Sanhedrîn lasted but a very short time. It may also be remarked that the words John xviii. 25–27 are evidently, according to the context, not meant to imply that Peter followed Jesus in the middle of the night into the house of Caiaphas, and exhibited there his fear of man under similar circumstances: the two disciples might not follow him thither.

[3] See *ante*, p. 39. It appears from Theodoricus, *de Locis Sanctis*, p. 25, Tobler's edit., that in the middle ages it was still thought that the λιθόστρωτον, John xix. 13 (comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 1, 8) could be shown upon the 'Sion.'

would have been stoning,[1] the witnesses casting the first stones: but, as was seen above, witnesses could not in this case be found; and if they succeeded in bringing him to death after the Roman manner as guilty of high treason, they calculated that the infamy would be much greater, while at the same time the public responsibility would be transferred from them to the Roman Governor. The transactions thus opened with Pilate are related with considerable particularity in the earlier narrative, but incomparably more so by John: and as Pilate took part in them, either quite publicly in the front of his judgment hall, or, if within it, still always in the presence of a number of Romans, it is not surprising, particularly considering their importance, that the memory of them was faithfully enough preserved.

They who came on the hasty mission might not enter the heathen Prætorium, because those who desired to keep a feast must, according to ancient custom, keep themselves clean three days before, or, according to the interpretation of the ancient words of the Law then prevalent, must not come into contact with heathen edifices.[2] Accordingly Pilate, leaving the bound prisoner in the house, came to the door to them, but (as he quickly perceived from the written accusation the insignificance of the charge itself) he showed at first no inclination whatever to take up the case, and sought to leave to them a slight punishment of him: but they insisted upon the punishment of death, which had to be confirmed by him—namely, his crucifixion, which they had demanded from the very first.[3] So he went back again into the Prætorium to ask Jesus whether he was really the 'king of the Jews': and Jesus would undoubtedly have briefly denied the question as thus proposed if the Governor had put it to him merely from himself. But as he learned that the accusation laid against him was based precisely upon it, he stated that he was indeed a king, that his kingdom, however, was not like any of the other kingdoms of this world, but the kingdom of the truth itself, which was open to every man; and repeated this, when called upon to do so, as distinctly as possible. It is true it appeared to Pilate a matter of indifference, as he frankly and almost satirically declared, what the truth was the kingdom of which Jesus claimed: but if he was in-

[1] See *Antiquities*, p. 316, comp. with *Mishna* Sanhedrîn xi. 5.

[2] See *Antiquities*, p. 107. At that time the three days may have been reduced to one, as may be inferred from *Mishna* Pes. chap. i.

[3] This is also implied in the words John xviii. 32, only that John thereby refers more particularly to what had been said by him before, iii. 12, xii. 32, 33.

clined to consider the prisoner as one of many fools, just as superior Romans were inclined to treat with extreme indifference all the endless philosophies and religions of the day coming under their notice, he still could not consider him a man deserving of death, and therefore proposed to liberate him.

It was undoubtedly at this stage of the proceedings that Pilate resolved to send Jesus to Antipas, as his Galilean ruler, who was then likewise present at Jerusalem for the feast; he thus resolved in the confident hope that this prince would not judge the accused so severely as the members of the Hagiocracy; he also desired probably thereby to show to Antipas an attention, and to remove a measure of dissension existing between them. It is true Luke[1] only speaks of this useless interlude; still it does not appear how it could be a pure invention: moreover Antipas's residence was at the time close at hand.[2] The vain Tetrarch, who, as it happened, had never seen Christ, though he had heard so much about his miracles, was highly delighted to see him, but found him perfectly silent, as the earlier narrative mentions expressly his taciturnity in the transactions before Pilate; and why should he speak much? So the Tetrarch, with the brutal soldiers who were present, contented himself with mocking him in various ways, and at last sending him back to Pilate in a gorgeous robe like that of a king. He could not have done anything more in accordance with the view of this Roman: this mock regal garb conveyed Herod's opinion that the man charged with claiming to be a king should be treated as a fool. It was very suggestively said amongst the people, that from that day these two magnates were friends.

Pilate had meanwhile repeatedly assured the accusers and the rest of the people who had gathered at the instigation of the members of the Hagiocracy around the court of justice, that he could not discover any guilt in him; but at the same time he purposed, if the worst came to the worst, to propose to them a choice which, as he in his astuteness reckoned, must necessarily lead to the liberation of the prisoner. According to the custom of the time, the Governor liberated one prisoner to the petitioning people annually at the Passover:[3] he wished

[1] Not only in his Gospel, xxiii. 6–12, but also Acts iv. 27.

[2] See *ante*, p. 39 [and note, *infra* p. 455].

[3] We do not now know how old this custom was: but if, according to *Antiquities*, p. 353, note, it was thus early the usage to execute many criminals at Easter, the contrary custom of liberating one of the multitude could easily arise. Moreover, the Passover, although the feast of serious gloomy purification, is also the feast of transition and of mercy: and thus that custom was perhaps of very early origin, only that it is accidentally not mentioned before.

to put before them the choice[1] of setting free either a certain man, likewise called Jesus, though usually Barabban,[2] who had been condemned for sedition, murder, and robbery, or the prisoner immediately before him, with the expectation that they would be sure not to demand the release of such a dangerous criminal as the former. And as Jesus just then returned from the Tetrarch, Pilate began more earnestly to try the course which he had suggested to him: he ordered him to be scourged by the soldiers and otherwise mistreated, to have a crown of thorns placed in mockery on his head, and a purple garment on his shoulders, and presented him, as thus already chastised and ridiculed as a king, to the people, to see whether they would not yet be seized with pity for him.[3] But the people, who made themselves heard at this point, desired the crucifixion of Jesus and the release of Barabban: and thereby Pilate had got entangled in his own astutely invented stratagem. Accordingly he determined at all events not to lend his own soldiers for the crucifixion, that it might not take place under Roman sanction: indeed, as it was declared to him that a man who deemed himself the son of God must be publicly executed according to their law, he was, being a superstitious man, overtaken by fear, had Jesus brought again into the judgment hall to question him on this point, and thus at last still put before him the prospect of his release. How deeply the idea of a superstitious dread being felt by the Governor was rooted in the people is shown also by the tradition which is interwoven in one of the present Gospels, to the effect that Pilate's own wife, alarmed by a dream the previous night, sent to him during the trial her advice that he should release the innocent man.[4] As, however, Jesus remained speechless at that superstitious question of the Governor, he became for a moment angry with him, asking him whether he did not know that he could kill

[1] Although this proposing of a choice is now expressed quite clearly only Matt. xxvii. 17, it is implied in the other Gospels also. With regard to Barabban himself, comp. further, p. 68.

[2] This name was found in this form, according to Jerome in his *Comment. Matt.* xxvii., in the Gospel of the Hebrews (for his words cannot be otherwise understood), and this is certainly the original orthography. He was accordingly the son of a Rabbi, *ante*, p. 232; and his real name was Jesus (see *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 437): so that Pilate could the more easily select him on account of the strange coincidence of the names.

[3] In this way this mockery, John xix. 1–5, is more easily intelligible than if it did not occur until after the sentence had been passed, as is the case in the earlier narrative: for as Pilate generally desired to spare him, it is not probable that he at last commanded that the sentence of death, which was passed contrary to his desire, should be aggravated by such inflictions, although this undoubtedly always happened in other cases before the crucifixion.

[4] Matt. xxvii. 19; comp. *Jahrbb. der B. W.* vi. pp. 49 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. p. 154].

him or release him; but Jesus this time calmly answered, that he would have no power over him unless it had been given by God to him as the highest authority of the time in the land: and that, as far as human sin was in this case operative, he had not the greater guilt, but that man who had treacherously delivered him into his magisterial power.[1] It is true that, having been staggered by such a decisive answer repeated again, he now once more proposed to the people his release: but they loudly asked whether he was really determined not to punish a rebel against the Imperial Majesty. This subdued a man who trembled at the thought of a complaint against him in Rome: he proceeded to pronounce from the judgment-seat[2] the sentence, which, according to custom, could contain only a brief summary of the transaction.[3] But it is quite intelligible that the simple popular tradition should narrate, that though Pilate gave way at last, that the tumult of the people might not increase, before the sentence was spoken publicly he washed his hands as if in innocence before the whole people and the witnessing sun just then rising, disclaiming all higher responsibility in the matter.[4]

His crucifixion and burial.

Accordingly the punishment of death must, without further mercy and without the least delay, be inflicted upon him, even in a form which was at once the most painful and ignominious. According to the peculiar form of this punishment, the criminal was at the place of crucifixion nailed by his hands, and generally also by his feet, to the cross before it was raised, and it was then, after it had been raised, made firm in the ground, or he was thus nailed to it after it had been previously set up. The cross was generally not high: but it had in the middle a small projection of wood, upon which the criminal must at the same time sit, whilst the crossbeam above was likewise on the front of the upright; thereby it was indeed provided against that he should not, by perhaps the weight of his body, sink too low or become unsteady, but the duration of the torture until death

[1] It cannot be the least doubtful, even according to John vi. 64, 71, xii. 4, xiii. 2, 11, 21, xviii. 2 sq., comp. Mark xiv. 21 (Matt., Luke), that Jesus meant Judas by the man referred to, xix. 11.

[2] See *ante*, p. 39.

[3] The words John xix. 14–16 are certainly intended to supply nothing more than a brief final summary of this kind.

[4] Matt. xxvii. 24, 25, as well as what is said regarding Pilate's wife in the Book of Higher Gospel History, Matt. xxvii. 19 [see Translator's Preface]; Evang. Nicod. ix.; comp. also *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* viii. p. 195.

occurred was by this little rest granted to the body only made still worse. As a punishment invented by diabolical art in torture, it was regarded, like all similar ones, as peculiarly that of slaves or other criminals that had sunk to the lowest level: the Carthaginians and Persians probably punished thus those charged with high treason also,[1] but this most revolting punishment was employed most of all by the Romans upon both their immense numbers of slaves and in the provinces upon persons guilty of high treason in an aggravated form; but it was still regarded in the Roman empire as essentially the punishment of slaves, inasmuch as the inhabitants of the provinces were degraded to the position of slaves as soon as they committed crimes. It was entirely foreign to the spirit of the religion of the Old Testament and the ancient customs of Israel:[2] so much the worse was it that it should now be demanded by the representatives of the Hagiocracy in the case of a member of their own people, and one moreover who was innocent; and it required the Roman, that is, the most perfectly developed heathenism, to combine with the most degenerate and incorrigible element of the ancient Community of the true God, to accomplish the most terrible deed that could ever be done.

As Pilate ascended the judgment-seat to pronounce the final sentence, it was, according to John, about the sixth hour, that is, about the time of sunrise,[3] or not much later;[4] according to the earlier narrative it was about nine in the morning of our day[5] when he was nailed to the cross: and as a fact, from two to three hours might pass between that moment of the sentence and the actual commencement of the crucifixion, in the last preparations and the subsequent leading forth to the place of execution.

[1] Just. *Hist.* xxii. 7; Ezra vi. 11; Esther vii. 9, 10.

[2] See *Antiquities*, pp. 165, 316 sq.

[3] See *ante*, p. 245.

[4] John xix. 14: it follows from John's own intimation that the indication of the hour must not be understood too literally; but as the hearing before Pilate commenced, according to John xviii. 28, perhaps an hour before sunrise, it could an hour or an hour and a half later have reached the stage of the passing of the final sentence, and all that we know of that time does not necessarily lead us to the adoption of a later hour. But if, on the other hand, we sought to understand the sixth hour in John, according to another mode of reckoning (see *ante*, p. 245), as the hour of noon, there would arise a gross contradiction of the earlier narrative in a matter which could not possibly be so differently told, but also something quite inconceivable would follow. For in that case the actual crucifixion would not have begun until the afternoon, and would have lasted scarcely a few hours, inasmuch as it had to cease before sunset.—It is well known that the great Roman officials were in the habit of conducting their business early in the day, that is, before sunrise (comp. Friedländer's *Sittengeschichte Rom's*, i. [e.g., pp. 136 sq. 264 sq., 2nd ed. 1865]).

[5] Mark xv. 25: it is merely for brevity's sake that Matthew and Luke omit the hour here, as they subsequently keep to the sixth hour (noon) at the proper place.

To these preparations belonged, according to the usual custom, the official statement of the crime, which had to be written in great letters and affixed to the head of the cross. Pilate commanded that simply the words 'Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Judeans' should be placed in the Hebrew, Roman, and Greek tongues over the cross. The members of the Hagiocracy, who, smitten with an evil conscience, regarded it now as almost an insult to the Judean name that such a man should be publicly executed as their king, desired that Pilate would state in the inscription that Jesus had only himself made this claim, but was never acknowledged by them; however, the Governor paid no heed to this tardy stirring of national pride, in conformity with his whole behaviour in this matter, which seemed to him rather bordering on the ridiculous. This detail again is reported by John only: it is apparently of small moment, but very significant with regard to the general relation of the active agents in the matter.

The place of the crucifixion, where without doubt all such executions near Jerusalem were then carried out, was situated not far from the city, but yet outside its walls and surrounded by gardens:[1] the traditional horror of the people of any contact with dead bodies, which was also sanctioned by the Law, would never have tolerated such a place, any more than burial-places, within the city.[2] It was called Golgotha, or, as all the Gospels translate it, Place of a Skull; Luke also, who everywhere avoids all but Greek terms, has even adopted merely this translated name. The name Skull points probably to a bare unfruitful hill rising from the land like a skull, which would in fact be best adapted for a place of execution: but the name, as far as we can yet discover, does not occur before, and probably first in the new Jerusalem took the place of the name of a hill in the older city with a similar significance.[3] It may have been situated on the north-west of the town, but

[1] In this instance also we owe the more precise details to John xix. 17, 20, 21, 22, 41.

[2] See *Antiquities*, pp. 153 sq. The graves of David and his successors, although within the city walls, were nevertheless in any case very isolated, and protected by their own walls. Importance is attached, Heb. xiii. 12, to the fact that Christ was crucified outside the city.

[3] Namely, of the hill Gareb, Jer. xxxi. 39; this גרב means properly to scrape: hence that which is scraped off, bare; also جرباء the *north* derives probably its name from the bare, desolate, barren land, as in צפון from the dark land; the idea of being scratched, that is, scabious, is connected therewith; the idea also of *experientia* تجربة comes from that of scratching, seeking. It is true the hill Gareb now occurs in that one passage only; but its general situation at all events there cannot be doubtful. Compare my last remarks on this word in the *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1865, p. 1286.

was undoubtedly farther away than the spot where, since Constantine's time, the Holy Sepulchre has been supposed to be found, and where it is still shown;[1] although this place at all events lies somewhat to the north-west, and an early reminiscence of this locality may have been preserved in a general form. If then the judgment hall in which Pilate was residing was situated, as we have seen,[2] a good deal to the east of the city, the way from it to Golgotha was not very short: which we can see also from the special reminiscences of the events of this unparalleled day of the sentence and execution.

For Christ was compelled, like every other man who had been sentenced to such a death, to carry his cross from the judgment hall to the place of execution, attended by Roman soldiers, and by two robbers who were to be crucified with him: upon the long road his burden became too heavy for him, and a certain Simon of Cyrene, who was just coming from the field into the city, and thus met the procession, was compelled to carry it for him,[3] the earlier narrative still considering the incident important enough to be reported. It was quite natural that a large crowd of people, and particularly many women, with loud lamentation, should follow the procession, and likewise that there should be amongst them many of his most faithful adherents, now seized with terror and profound sorrow: still it is a late book from which Luke first adopts some consoling words which Christ addressed particularly to the women that bewailed him.[4] Of the Eleven, as to whose conduct

[1] The first Christians precisely of that time which is here of importance, namely, of the Apostolic time, sought truly Christ elsewhere than in the grave, or generally in any definite spot of the earth; and we can neither prove it, nor is it in itself probable, that they, like the Buddhists and the Muslim, made pilgrimages to the grave of their Lord, and noted particularly its locality. The destruction of Jerusalem, which soon followed, obliterated moreover more and more such localities of smaller extent; and subsequent to this destruction the place Golgotha was not used again as before. Vogue, *le temple de Jerusalem* (1864) pp. 114 sq., is very decidedly in favour of the genuineness of the present Holy Sepulchre, especially for the reason that east of it traces of the second wall have been found; likewise Rosen, *das Haram von Jerusalem und der Tempelplaz des Moria* (Gotha, 1866), and others. Comp., however, *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1864, pp. 725 sq. Further compare the remarks in the *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* ii. pp. 118 sq., vi. pp. 84 sq. Neither do the words of the martyr Lucianus, circ. 310 (in Ruffin. *Hist. Eccles.* ix. 6, i. p. 516), mention the cross, which was first rediscovered under Constantine, in connection with the locality which has since been adopted; and moreover this entire discourse of the martyr is wanting at this place, ix. 6, in the *Ecc. Hist.* of Eusebius translated by Rufinus. It is scarcely deserving a serious refutation, if some scholars, following the fancies of Fergusson, seek the grave even on Moria on the site of the Mosque of *el Ssachra* (of the Rock).

[2] *Ante*, p. 39.

[3] The soldiers were, as Romans, above such a menial task, but were allowed by usage in cases of necessity to force non-Romans of the provinces to perform base services. However, it appears to follow from the way in which Mark relates the incident that this Simon was from that moment converted to Christ with all his house.

[4] See *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 443. sq.

on this day the narratives are silent, with one exception to be presently mentioned, the most by far seem to have kept more at a distance,[1] that they might escape the first rage of the storm; and he was himself on this day still great enough to seek to bear the utmost desolation alone, and not now to desire the presence of his most intimate disciples.

Thus the procession arrived at the place of execution: the rude soldiers, about to nail his hands and feet to the cross,[2] and to erect it between those of the two robbers, presented to him, as custom required, a stupefying draught, but he determined to endure all his pains in the full possession of consciousness, and strengthened himself even by the prayer to his Father to forgive those who knew not what they were doing;[3] and these soldiers were really but the ignorant instruments for the execution of commands the reasons of which they did not understand, though certainly by their own fault indifferent enough not seriously to ask for them. There were four of them, as we are more particularly informed on all these points by John, who formed at one time the watch by the cross: they divided among themselves, according to custom, the garments of the crucified, cutting his upper garment into four pieces, casting lots for his under garment, which was, as we have seen, woven in one piece.[4]

Now first, when he seemed with his whole cause irretrievably lost, could the scorn and ridicule of the world break unhindered over him, and the malicious joy of the representatives of the Hagiocracy burst forth. It is impossible to exaggerate this contumely, the sounds of which were mingled even with the approaching festal rejoicing:[5] and the earlier narrative

[1] Comp. Luke xxiii. 49.

[2] It is, however, only in the later narrative, Luke xxiv. 39, that it is supposed that the feet were likewise not merely bound but nailed; on the other hand, this is not presupposed by John xx. 25–27. As a fact, if this was also customary at other times, it was not precisely necessary; and in Palestine particularly the idea had been still preserved in the middle ages, that he was nailed by his hands only: comp. the collected accounts of the Oriental mode of crucifixion in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, i. pp. 120 sq. The same uncertainty as regards the feet appears in the Apocryphal Gospels: comp. Wright's *The Departure of my Lady Mary from the World* (in Journal of Sacred Literature, Jan. 1865. pp. 417 sq., and April 1865, pp. 110 sq.) p. 9, 9. with the *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*, by the same author, pp. 37. 17; 39. 14, where the hands merely are mentioned.

[3] But this detail of narrative, appropriate as it is according to the whole feeling of Christ, belongs to those adopted by Luke only from his sources.

[4] *Ante*, p. 186.

[5] As we may very plainly infer from the prophetic reverse of these last moments sketched Rev. xi. 10; for the Apocalyptic author here generally borrows very many colours of his sketch of the future from recollections of the history of Christ himself. Nevertheless we must take great care not to regard the details which this author here transfers in imagination to the future as a mere repetition of historical facts connected with Christ: as recently some one has fallen into this palpable mistake.

reports still quite simply how the Roman soldiers, whose imagination must have been specially excited by the crime charged against him of wishing to be the 'King of the Judeans' fiercely mocked him precisely as a king; how the leisurely and thoughtless spectators passing by the cross, the representatives of the Hagiocracy keeping somewhat further away, and indeed even the two robbers crucified with him—every one after his way of thinking—gave free course to their insolent speeches. However, Christian feeling soon preferred to turn quite away from thinking upon these abominations, smitten by the all-conquering truth of the utterance of Christ himself, as he prayed in the face of such sufferings for the divine pity upon his tormentors: and it is as if the impossibility of conceiving that even all those who had hitherto not known Christ should be able to join in this reviling, had with such matchless effect transformed the tradition of the railing of even the two crucified with him; for as we now read the tradition in Luke, one of the two, now brought to repentance by his punishment, and beholding on the other hand the innocent sufferings of the righteous one, rebuked the other for his reviling, and applied not in vain for the intercession of Christ.[1] And if already Luke is unwilling to disturb the recollection of the last moments on earth of the Holy One of God by the relation of the revilings of the various classes of men, which indeed could be easily supposed, still less is John willing to do this; this Apostle the less, inasmuch as he in another place in his Gospel had already sufficiently referred to their historical existence.[2] So much the more gladly does John refer to a trait of purest love and tender providence which Christ displayed as he hung upon the cross. Whilst the disciples and other close friends of Jesus kept in the raging of this storm at a distance from its scene, and the believing women, who as women had less to fear at this moment, stood around the cross, but at a little distance, of these women four only, the mother of Jesus himself and her sister Salome,[3] with two other Marys,[4] and of the Twelve, John, came somewhat nearer. He then with a few words commended John as son to his mother, Mary as mother to him, thus afresh establishing the relation, which was now completely dissolved between him and his mother, in the one way suitable for both,

[1] The passage Luke xxiii. 39–43 can only be regarded as having been taken, together with the remaining additions which Luke here makes to the history of the crucifixion, from a later source.

[2] Compare especially John xvi. 20.

[3] See *ante*, p. 181.

[4] According to John xix. 25, compared with Mark xv. 40, 41, 47, xvi. 1, and above, p. 305; but we must consider all this further in vol. vi. [German.]

and particularly for the beloved disciple. His own brothers [1] had as yet not become believing enough for this: accordingly, that brother adopted at the moment of his departure from this life received his mother into his house; and if he himself resolved not to pass over in his Gospel this and many similar details, which, it is true, had immediately only significance for a few individuals, he did this evidently not for love of fame, but it was for him in his advanced years a sweet reward to recall all this more vividly; but for his readers it is, without his intending it, an indication that he only could have written all these special incidents.

But this same earlier narrative which, in accordance with its thoroughly honest simplicity, has not passed over in silence that coarsest ridicule of the world, has also the intelligent insight to perceive that precisely from this profoundest humiliation must rise the highest glory, and the infinitely momentous turning-point of this entire divine-human history must begin from that very moment in which it is least anticipated in the world of men. If the immeasurable reality which lies hidden here must be put into wholly inadequate words, it is certainly the simplest and at the same time the most beautiful record, that after Christ had borne for the first three hours on the cross the profoundest suffering conceivable, just at noon a darkness which lasted three hours until his death, came over the earth, as if now already, from that mysterious place which finally punishes all human guilt, the prelude of the future righteous judgment arose in the sorrow of the whole world for the approaching death of the Holy One who had been so infinitely wronged by men. But the Holy One himself also, the simple narrative proceeds, for the first time uttered, as if involuntarily, in this horrible darkness and as the last struggle with death approached, in the words of the Psalm of profoundest lamentation, that human despair which he had hitherto always overcome even under the most extreme sufferings; as if, with the cry of the dying one at last piercing the whole world, he would with mightiest effort call upon God Himself to carry on that work which he must now on earth resign; thus certainly did the human feeling in him remain pure to the last moment. And it is quite intelligible that the surrounding friends, pierced by the mighty cry of the Holy One, misled by a misunderstanding of one of his words, supposed that he called Elias to his assistance, and that one of them hastened to quench his thirst with a draught of vinegar, as

[1] See *ante*, pp. 314 sq., 358.

if Elias could yet really come to deliver him:[1] but even the last human hope, wherever and whatever it might be, must fail, and with a last mighty cry[2] he breathed forth his spirit, whilst, as if for a celestial sign that with this life that also of the entire national religion as it had hitherto been was already substantially ended, the veil of the holy of holies in the Temple was rent from top to bottom, and even the heathen centurion[3] standing by had to confess that God's Son had there suffered and died.

In this narrative everything is imposing, exhaustive, and closely connected: and whoever desires may further inquire whether the purely celestial phenomena, the darkness of those three hours,[4] and the rending of the Temple veil,[5] which are here quite briefly introduced, have an ordinary historical meaning, and on the ground of what occurrences they were interwoven into this narrative. But as such vast moments of history as these, if the attempt is made to exhaust their deeper meaning, still transcend every attempt to describe them in their connection with the spiritual and physical world generally in all their magnitude and marvellousness, and on that account provoke ever fresh attempts to represent them, so we see from the present Gospel of Matthew how the effort was ventured to represent further the moment of this unparalleled death in

[1] According to the somewhat freer reproduction in the present Gospel of Matthew, those who were active, Mark xv. 35, 36, would not be believers in Elias and Christ: still the above is probably the original meaning of the narrative.

[2] The later work which Luke used xxiii. 46, ventured to interpret this last cry by the words Psalm xxxi. 6 (5): this later work is, however, generally characterised by the endeavour to represent the elevation of such moments by words from the Old Testament, and was therefore probably the Book of Higher Gospel History [see Translator's Preface].

[3] Called Longinus in Evang. Nicod., which generally carries out further and more freely everything relating to the history of Christ's sufferings and death. See *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* vi. pp. 49 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 154 sq.] But this name, which has of late been ridiculously derived from the λόγχη, John xix. 34, was manifestly only taken from the Consul of the year 30 A.D., just as the well-known Epistle of Lentulus from the Consul of the year 26. See Tac. *Ann.* iv. 46, and introductions to v. i.

[4] For the tracing of which elsewhere in ordinary physical history, every assistance and also all justification are now wanting. It is true the eclipse of the sun occurring in the year 33 A.D., according to an account of Phlegon's (in *Georg. Syncel. Chronogr.* p. 614, ed. Dind.), which (as it appears) was observed at noon, attended by a violent earthquake, in Nicæa in Bithynia, has often been adduced; but on account of the Easter full moon alone, an actual eclipse of the sun cannot be thought of in connection with the Gospel history. The Roman Annals, which were appealed to in the discourse of the martyr Lucianus (according to Rufinus' *Hist. Ecc.* i. p. 517), were probably the so-called *Acta Pilati*, with regard to which see *Jahrbb. d. B. W.* vi. pp. 49 sq. [now *Die drei ersten Evang.* i. pp. 154 sq.]. On the contrary, we may see the actual origin of this and all similar features in narratives of this kind, in the Lamentation for Omar, for instance, where he is called *a slain one for whom the earth grew dark, Hamása*, p. 488, 8.

[5] Neither in this instance do we now know from other sources what event and what reminiscence gave rise to this conception, which received its proper significance from Christian ideas.

corresponding elevation. If already at noon on this day the earth was darkened, three hours later, in that awful moment of death, it was so convulsed that the rocks were rent and the graves opened: and as if this moment extended its effects beyond all time, and the consummation of all things and the last judgment would now take place, even many of the saints that had fallen asleep arose from their graves and showed themselves in the holy city.[1] Thus properly is precisely this moment of his death regarded as the great boundary line of all the ages, and the period of the profoundest convulsion of the whole past history of the world. But, since after all even the highest representations of the significance of this moment are never adequate, it is in fact equally worthy of it when John seeks to describe the end of the history of this life on earth rather in a few great words. And as he seeks with special care prototypes from the Old Testament, precisely for all the most prominent points of the unexpected and, in the case of so many, the shocking issue of this life, he accordingly narrates that Christ, when he perceived that everything had been accomplished, as if thereby even his last thought corresponded unintentionally with the complete fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies, complained of thirst,[2] as in fact persons enduring crucifixion suffer greatly from thirst: that then a sponge filled with vinegar was put to his mouth upon a hyssop-stalk, and that after he had taken this vinegar, bowing his head he gave up his spirit with the cry 'It is finished!' Thus the narrative of John at this point has become a very simple one, but undoubtedly in quite another way than the above earlier one.

This endeavour to find a fulfilment of Old Testament prototypes very especially in the issue of this history, where it comes with such force into the light of the great world, is shown in John's case immediately in another aspect of it in the course of the events. According to a legal provision of the Book of Deuteronomy,[3] the hanged criminals must not remain unburied after the evening of the day of execution. Now it is true that there was no law compelling the extension of this legal benefaction to those who had been crucified after the Roman

[1] If the reading 'after *his aὐτοῦ* resurrection' had from the first been in our present Gospel of Matt., the last author of it must have interpreted it of Christ's resurrection, as if it were not proper that they should enter the holy city earlier. However, in the Book of Higher Gospel Hist., which is evidently the source used in this case, the words were undoubtedly not found.

[2] For without doubt the words John xix. 28–30 regard the passage Ps. lxix. 22 (21) as one which must be fulfilled by Christ at the last moment.

[3] See *Antiquities*, pp. 316 sq.; comp. Philo, in *Flacc.* ch. x. (ii. p. 529).

mode,[1] but inasmuch as it was not an ordinary Sabbath but this year the great Easter festival which was to follow that Friday, on which day it was therefore the more desirable that a great rest and the cessation of all occupations should be observed over the whole land, the request was made to Pilate that the crucified men might be killed on the cross before the evening. According to custom, therefore, their legs were battered in pieces: but when the turn of Jesus came, and it was observed that he was already dead, one of the soldiers simply pierced his side, in order to convince himself that death had really already taken place; and the blood and water which immediately flowed forth gave evidence that death had already occurred.[2] But the fact that he who was slain about the time when the Passover sacrifice was killed, and who had fallen as the infinitely nobler and truer Passover (that is, atoning) sacrifice, was also in this unexpectedly marvellous manner now first made perfectly complete as a sacrifice, like the Passover lamb, without any breaking of the bones,[3] appeared to John so memorable that he cannot sufficiently in this case assure his readers that he certainly saw and carefully noted all this with his own eyes. It was, however, only in the Apostolic times that this observation was first felt to be of such importance, as we shall see further below.—There is not the most remote reason for doubting the fact that Jesus was actually quite dead when taken down from the cross. For though those who have been crucified not infrequently survive the first, and indeed the third or fourth day, and though the convulsions, and indeed the beautiful transfigurations, of the whole countenance which the profoundest of all pains occasion in young strong men may be extremely marvellous,[4] still,

[1] At all events John's manner of stating the matter, xix. 31, presupposes that this was the case.

[2] It is wholly vain that some have sought something quite extraordinary and miraculous according to John's meaning in this blood and water: the meaning of his narrative does not in the least point to anything of the kind, and all the fine-spun conjectures of most recent times regarding the higher significance of these two words (with which, moreover, the words 1 John v. 8, have nothing in common) are upset by noting this simple fact. It was undoubtedly possible, as the bodies were not suspended by any means at a great height, to distinguish quite well what flowed forth from the spear-wound; and when all the conjectures in earlier and recent times regarding the cause of the more rapid death of Christ have been considered, it still remains most probable that the outflow of water and blood from the pierced heart of him who had probably died only an hour, or a still shorter time before, points to a sudden breaking of the heart which occasioned death, and by which the terrible loud cry of anguish immediately preceding it is most easily explained. This is also substantially the view of the medical work on this matter by Wm. Stroud, M.D. (London, 1847); see particularly pp. 94 sq., 399 sq.

[3] See *Antiquities*, p. 354.

[4] As the above-mentioned narrative of the crucifixion of a slave in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, i. p. 121, supplies of this a very remarkable example.

apart from the care which was then so strict in this matter on the part of the Government, to say nothing of the express evidence of John, Christ had been too greatly exhausted by the previous days, and especially by the last night (as appeared already on the way to crucifixion, and indeed the previous evening in Gethsemane),[1] to admit of surprise at the fact that death in his case should take place somewhat earlier.[2] Only on account of the short duration of his crucifixion, and inasmuch as, according to all the accounts, he had immediately before his death a completely unbroken, strong, and loud voice, we may well suppose as certain that at last a sudden inward disturbance caused death by the breaking of the heart, to which the bursting forth of blood and water also points.

As the representatives of the Hagiocracy, who, though insensible towards the higher truth, scrupulously observed the lower legal forms, were compelled by anticipation to heed the special nature of this day,[3] they had certainly sought from the Governor early on the day permission to accelerate the conclusion of the crucifixion; and that battering of the legs on the cross probably took place very soon after three o'clock in the afternoon, or not very long after the death of Jesus. However, the bodies remained hanging on the cross until the other two now expired the more quickly. About this time one of the secret admirers of Jesus in the Sanhedrîn, Joseph of Arimathea,[4] had gone to Pilate with the request to be allowed to take down and bury the body of Jesus: the Governor, after he had ascertained that Jesus was already dead, gave permission, and the friend laid the body, wrapped according to custom in linen cloths, in the new rock-hewn tomb of a garden situated in the immediate neighbourhood. On account of the nearness of the Sabbath, a more distant place suited for the reception of the body could not be sought for: accordingly this nearest place worthy of the purpose was provisionally adopted.[5] According to John, who everywhere traces the

[1] See p. 423.

[2] The conjecture of an apparent death really arose in modern times from considerations which are wholly foreign to the matter itself, and do not deserve any serious refutation.

[3] Which is most plainly described, John xix. 31, as a *παρασκευή*, i.e. a Friday before *the great day of the Sabbath*, i.e. before the *feast day* of Unleavened Bread which this time fell upon a Saturday, as a similar designation occurs in Jewish writings (comp. e.g. Ad. Neubauer's, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Karäerthumes*, Leipsic, 1866, p. 47).

[4] The ancient Râmathâim, or, with the article, Ha-râmathâim, as to the situation of which see vol. ii. p. 421. Vandevelde supposed at last, 1861–62, that he had rediscovered it in the place Beth-rima, between the modern places Megdel and Sing'il, a little to the north of Tibne and Abud; if its possession had formerly long been matter of dispute, according to vol. v. p. 228, the addition *πόλις τῶν Ἰουδαίων* Luke xxiii. 51 is the more intelligible.

[5] This view of the matter, which has an important bearing on the history, fol-

manifestations of sympathy on the part of the Nicodemus above referred to,[1] this member of the Sanhedrîn rendered assistance at the entombment, particularly also by procuring abundant incense and aloes: and, although according to the earlier account, the women also who had remained not far from the cross and noted the place where he was buried, remembered likewise the last ministries of love, they nevertheless, on account of the retarding effects of their profound grief, were too late[2] with their preparations with that view for that day, since the Sabbath began immediately after sunset.

3. *His eternal glory.*

Accordingly, as far as the will and the hand of man availed, he to whom neither as far as he was a man like others, nor as far as, unlike any other man, he was the Messiah of Israel, the smallest actual sin attached, had been removed as a criminal. He who alone appeared in the right way as the true Messiah, expected through so many centuries, and as the sublime and devout hope of Israel, in whom all the purest and highest endeavour of the Community of the true religion, and, inasmuch as this was the climax of all the religions of antiquity, no less of all the human race at that period, attained its highest summit, had been rejected and most deeply humiliated by the heads of the people of God, after an education of some fifteen centuries, and by the great masses of this people themselves no less than by the representative heathen empire. He who sought to found the imperishable weal of Israel, and by Israel the weal of all nations, and who showed in the one right way how all human weal can alone germinate and ripen, was branded by the highest tribunal, both of Israel and of heathenism, as the most dangerous misleader of men. He who had shown nothing but the highest wisdom, the purest divine love, and the most inexhaustible gentleness to all the error, sin, and cruelty which had grown greater and more

lows plainly enough from the words John xix. 41, 42. According to the last author of the Gospel of Matt., xxvii. 60, the unused tomb in the rock was the property of this Joseph of Arimathea: but the original narrative, Mark xv. 46, Luke xxiii. 53, does not contain this addition, and agrees therefore substantially with John; and it is at all events of itself doubtful whether a member of the Sanhedrîn, resident at Arimathea and present in Jerusalem probably only temporarily, would erect for himself there a tomb.

[1] Pp. 260 sq.

[2] There is therefore really no contradiction strictly between John and the earlier narrative as regards this incense, inasmuch as these two classes of mourners were very different, the one class hardly knowing anything of the other, and the good purposes of the women remaining in the end unexecuted: whilst a certain quantity of incense was probably necessary from the very beginning. Further comp. on all this vol. vi. [German].

grievous through so many millenniums from the beginning of the human race, had fallen from the fact that all the sin of the obduracy of Israel and of the frivolity of heathenism combined for his destruction. In that nation which before all others ought to have been the pure, holy, and beloved one of heaven, but nevertheless had suffered so many errors and sins after some fifteen hundred years to become so rampant in it, the entire force of these old and hardened errors and sins was turned against him as in one combined mass. For it was not on account of a single, and as it were accidental question, as was the case with the Baptist,[1] or in a sudden casual rising of the people, that he fell, but simply in connection with the one great question of the whole development of Israel, that is, of the Community of the true religion, and at the foremost point of the struggle for its highest truth and its very existence upon earth. But even the obduracy of all the error and all the sin in Israel, as it had now assumed its highest form in the Hagiocracy, could not suffice, again, by itself to destroy him, and was compelled to call to its assistance the Roman government, and in this the most terrible and severe government of all heathendom. Thus the force and brunt of all the sins of all antiquity turned against him alone, the solitary, weak, unarmed man, who was not seeking any human power and glory whatsoever. In this case all the extremest and most diametrical antitheses of all history down to that time, inasmuch as heathen history had already become inseparably involved in that of Israel, were brought together in the most absolute and concentrated manner. And with the solitary founder of a community of the perfect true religion this religion itself seemed to be completely destroyed again, just as it had been scarcely established.

It does not belong to this, but to the following period, to describe connectedly and explain in detail, how precisely from that moment when the perfect kingdom of God, just as it had been founded on the earth, seemed to be fully annihilated, together with its king who had appeared amongst men in such an insignificant form, its invincible power, on the contrary, was most wonderfully proved, and how out of the grave of its founder, who had been slain solely by human sin at its climax, there arose, on the contrary, his infinitely more powerful resuscitation and undying glory. The death and the grave of Christ are rapidly transient phenomena in his history, while they constitute the true closing moments of all ancient

[1] See *ante*, p. 199.

history generally: the end of ancient history does not arrive until this moment, but with it has certainly come, as if this grave were now closed simply in order that the entire era of the ancient human race might close with it. This, the true significance of the death and grave of Christ, must never be taken from them, nor the new life of Christ that follows be confounded with that which has been violently closed as if it were simply that which had before existed: by which confusion the profound suffering of this death would really be misunderstood and its infinite importance for us diminished. If, therefore, the Gospels briefly add some details that lie beyond this grave, they do it simply because though at that time this new glorified life of Christ, which, it is true, casts the brightest light upon his earthly life, and is as the higher aspect of it that had necessarily to follow, had indeed been already felt with perfect certainty, it had been felt only during a brief period: whilst the example of Luke in his second book shows that it is best to interweave everything subsequent to his death and burial with the history of the Apostolic age.

We must, on the contrary, say that everything that Jesus, according to the nature of the ancient expectation and hope, as well as from the necessity of the case itself, had to effect as Christ had been only in the very smallest degree already fully attained with his sufferings and death; that therefore everything connected with him which extends beyond the grave is itself the product of the completion of his work on earth, and thereby belongs to quite another part of the history. Even the highest divine power, when it clothes itself in a mortal body and appears in the midst of a definite age, finds in this body and this age its limitations: and never did Jesus as the Son and the Word of God confound himself with the Father and God Himself, or presumptuously make himself equal with Him. Accordingly the ancient Messianic hope, so far as it comprehended in all the details of its general scope at the same time the whole conceivable future, certainly contained more than Christ could accomplish in this frail body and this fleeting period. But *that* is not the truth and certainty of a prophecy and hope with regard to the entire kingdom of God, that they can be fulfilled in one definite period; and *that* is not their only proper fulfilment, that they shall be entirely fulfilled all at once in the course of the ages. And thus he had now appeared who alone, at this period and in the midst of this people of the dawning kingdom of God, could come as the true Messiah; and he had not merely fulfilled what those prophecies in their

deepest sense required of him, but labouring and founding his Community, suffering and dying, had really accomplished far more amid the extreme difficulties of the age than any ancient prophet could have foreseen and foretold in detail. The call which, though passing through the entire ancient history of all nations, was necessarily most powerfully and clearly heard in Israel,[1] and had become so irresistibly audible from the entire previous history of this nation, had come to him,—the call that surely some one must first come who, untouched and unsubdued by the errors and sins that had been growing ever greater during all the ages, should do perfectly the will of God; and, behold, his whole life and labours were the fulfilment of this call. The call did not simply reach him as if he had had in accordance with it something to do and to provide merely for himself, but it reached him in Israel in that way which was necessary precisely according to the characteristic primitive history of this people: that is, it came to him as one who, unaffected by all the sins of the world, could in everything follow absolutely the will of God in such a way that he should at the same time become the guide of all to the same perfection by the foundation of the Community of the perfect true religion. And, behold, he fulfilled this twofold call also so perfectly that there is no room at all for the question whether he was greater as an individual man or as the leader and head of a community founded by him. When he obeyed the call, the whole force and weight, which had grown heavier and more immovable during all past ages, of all the errors and sins of all mankind, and particularly (where this was most unpardonable) of the ancient people of the true religion, were thrown upon him alone, to stop his work or to annihilate himself. All the perversities and sins which had not been cancelled in the ancient Community, and had at last become more dark and obstinate, assailed him from his immediate neighbourhood, while from a distance, and yet at last equally close at hand, the whole frivolity and ignorance of heathenism in its strongest forms did the same, and thus the most painful lot conceivable overtook the most innocent One—him who had turned towards the world nothing but the purest truth and the most blessed services of love, it assailed with its deepest hatred, as if precisely this hero and this innocence were great and strong enough to suffer what no one before had ever suffered. But not for a moment did he waver, and showed himself as great in suffering and dying as in

[1] Comp. e.g. the touching wish Job xiv. 4. [See *Ewald's Commentary on the Book of Job*, Eng. translation, p. 165.]

working and contending. He drew to himself friends, brought disciples into a circle of closer intimacy: but he had at last to bear and suffer to the utmost everything quite alone and forsaken by all, perhaps in that only to be called happy, that like his labours so also his deepest sufferings had as regards their duration no too remote destination. For in this respect also everything in his case was concentrated and brought to its highest climax, in that his temporal trial was not only the most extreme through its sufferings, but also the most brief and yet the most ample.

But if he suffered the utmost forsaken of all, he was not forsaken of the true God, by whose power alone he did and suffered everything, so as to win by the same power the highest triumph precisely in the last outward defeat. For in him all the spiritual powers which had during some fifteen centuries separately operated and ruled in Israel as the people of the true religion, which tended to become perfect, were once more combined, that at the same time all the defects might be cast off which still cleaved to these separate powers, and the increasing predominance of which, and increasing evil effects of the co-operation of which, at last prevented all true progress and delayed the great consummation which ought now to come. In him in these late times the prophetic, as the primitive power which founded the Community of the true religion, was once more renewed, proclaiming with an immediate divine certainty, such as had not existed since Moses, new truths and investing them with ruling authority, but without any of the violence which was originally associated with the prophetic activity, illustrating every truth simply by its own proper light and commending it by its inherent goodness, so that even the last trace of the ancient prophetic oracular forms[1] has disappeared from the most human of discourses, and it is only the divinest certainty and calmest truth that shine forth. In him was renewed once more the long-lost characteristics of a true king of Israel, founding and maintaining a kingdom, giving the most difficult decisions with a royal word, and exercising in everything the highest authority, but only by the purest love of God as the highest power in founding a kingdom and labouring therein, and founding simply the universal kingdom of the perfect true religion which must proceed from Israel, but, extending beyond this, must embrace all men and nations, no longer confined to Israel and indissolubly connected with its human weaknesses. In him was also rejuvenated the ancient priestly power, mediating be-

[1] See *ante*, pp. 216 sq.; comp. vol. ii. pp. 113 sq., 159 sq.; vol. iv. pp. 168, 247.

tween man and God, and in its purified form leading to Him again, but no longer dependent upon a merely prophetic law, nor upon anything sacred by mere tradition and age or upon any other outward thing, but following simply the highest truth and perpetually renewing itself with the progress of that truth.[1] But all these highest spiritual powers which had arisen separately in Israel were combined in him in one centre such as had never before existed, simply because the power and the impulse of the perfect true religion in which they are all found, appeared in him at length actually in that form in which according to the divine will they were destined to appear from the beginning of all creation, but could appear in the first instance only at this time and in this nation and in this person.

Thus therefore he brought precisely that which, as we have seen,[2] was alone wanting for the perfection of the ancient true religion in its Community and after which this itself had long aspired—the invincible gladness, strength, and activity of the purest divine love, pervading all perception no less than all action, fulfilling all the good laws already in existence and not less alive to every new fact of knowledge and every new divine duty, authenticating itself to the world most distinctly in government, work, assistance, and guidance, but also in all obedience, all self-limitation, and all self-sacrifice. Thus he became the Son of God as no one had hitherto been, in a mortal body and in a fleeting space of time the purest reflection and the most perfect image of the Eternal Himself; thus he became the Word of God, speaking from God by his human word no less than by his whole appearing and work, and thus declaring to the world with an overwhelming force, an eternal indelible clearness such as no one before had equalled and no one after surpassed, God's most hidden mind, and indeed the very spirit of His activity itself: and thus the one true Messiah, the undying king of the kingdom of God which was in him first attaining its perfection amongst men, the one man to whom as Guide and Lord everyone must constantly look up and aspire whom the Spirit from that time forth draws to strive to attain, in meditation, or in work, or in suffering, purely and perfectly to God. Is perfection in what is humanly imperfect, undying immortality in what is perishably mortal, possible? He shows that it is, and proves it as nothing else has done; and will eternally show and prove it to all those who do not flee from his light. Before him no one amongst all the nations of the earth so much

[1] Comp. Matt. xiii. 52.

[2] Pp. 209 sq.

as properly conceived the problem which had here to be solved. Socrates in a long life scarcely attained so far as to begin even remotely to properly perceive it, while his scholars immediately lost sight of it again in the vain search for wisdom, and there was scarcely amongst the Stoics anything preserved which even distantly suggested the real problem itself. Buddha aimed after it by the creation of the same duality in man and in society which in Christendom has attractions only for the Pope and Papists, and ended thereby that he put himself in the place of God and thus banished every true God from the sphere of his influence, while he left the lower Gods to pursue their old courses more undisturbed than ever. Confucius thought from the beginning he could found and maintain the best kingdom simply by means of good teaching and good morals, and at most by means of an endeavour to attain perfection without a true living God. How far does Christ stand even above these greatest ones out of Israel! And if the kingdom of the two latter nevertheless still endures so wonderfully long, what is to be expected from the duration and stability of *his* kingdom!

There is probably no nation which could not see at last most perfectly realised in one of its members the highest ideal which it had most ardently longed for, perhaps through many centuries and with the deepest fervour and the most persistent endeavour. All its noblest powers and most exalted endeavours seem to have been united in this one, and accordingly easily become intensified in his case, and more easily still in most unexpected and marvellous ways when finally crowned with success; and precisely in the case of each of the noblest nations struggling after loftier aims, the highest struggling endeavour and effort is most easily thus gathered up in the concentrated energy of one individual on the margin of a long history. Thus all the fairest and loftiest things which the Greeks strove after were at last (inasmuch as dual tendencies had prevailed in this people from the first) gathered up in the two dissimilar contemporaries Aristotle and Alexander, and the best to which the Romans could attain in the one hero Julius Cæsar; under the Arabs Mohammed became later a hero of this kind. In Israel also all the most glorious and immortal things that it had ever striven after and hoped for through centuries and millenniums were at last gathered up and realised in Jesus of Nazareth: it was only in this nation that he could come, and he came in it as the one who had long been desired and expected, for whom the ways had already been prepared, although no one before him was able

really to find them. But as the highest struggle and endeavour of this nation, ever since the first times of the founding of the Community of the true God, were in it infinitely more exalted and divinely necessary than anything which appeared to other nations as their highest aim of life, and this final aim of all the noblest labour of this nation was subsequently in the course of the ages and under all the greatest vicissitudes, and indeed even amid the profoundest disturbances and longest obscurations, always only the more clearly perceived again and pursued afresh with the greater zeal, so now in him a hero had appeared upon the earth far humbler, more short-lived, and weaker than those examples just mentioned, and yet infinitely more exalted, more powerful, and more immortal than any of them.[1] The highest thing that could here come as the product and reward of all the struggles and victories of the innumerable host of men of God in Israel had now come, to which more clearly or obscurely the hope and longing of the noblest past had been directed, and that which was destined to have for all the future an incomparably higher significance: but it had come infinitely purer, and therefore also infinitely more through its own labours and sufferings, than through those of all the previous men of God.

O Christ, what after all these centuries, with all its ignoring and misdeeming of thee, is the world of to-day seeking after and effecting? They who are thine know thee, as they always in the past perceived, and also in all the future will always perceive, that thou art the sole unfailing instrument of the salvation of this world which history has brought to it.

[1] Aristotle's science, inasmuch as it did not venture to treat religion, history, and language, was left incomplete. As regards Alexander, a judgment similar to that which I expressed above, vol. v. pp. 223 sq., appears recently to have become more prevalent: but neither does Cæsar deserve by any means the eulogy which has been recently rendered to him by a German historian, not to the honour of German historical science. With regard to Mohammed I have spoken elsewhere.

INDEX.

Abba, as title of the heads of schools, 232
Ab beth din, rabbinic title, 14, 430
Abgar, king of Edessa, correspondence with Christ, 142
Aboth. See *Pirqæ Aboth*
Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, later Talmudic Collection of Sayings of the Fathers than Pirqæ Aboth, 13. [See *vol. v. p.* 275]
Abtalion, a rabbi, 14, 18
Aceldema, or *Hakeldamá*, 410
Aenon, near Salim, 198
Alexander, representative of highest attainment of Greece, p. 454 sq.
Ambivius, M., Roman Governor, 64
Annas (Anan, Hanna, and Channa), high priest, 64; a Sadducee, 140; hearing of Christ before, 429 sq.
Andrew, the Apostle, 245, 302
Antipas, Herod's youngest son, Tetrarch, 74–80; his opinion of Christ, 344; Christ taken before, 435
Antonia, castle in Jerusalem, formerly called *Baris*, 39 sq.
Apostles. See *Twelve*.
Aqueduct in Jerusalem constructed by Pilate, 67
'Aqîba, rabbi, 15, 35
Archælaus, Herod's son, *Ethnarch*, 76
Aretas, Arabian king, 76; war against Antipas, 78 sq.
Aristotle, representative of highest attainment of Greece, p. 454 sq.
Asmoneans, Palace of, in Jerusalem distinct from that of Herod, 455
Ass, the, the significance of Christ's choice of for his entry, 394 sq.
Asylum, right of in Sanctuary, 38

Beelzebul, Scribes express suspicion of Christ being possessed by, 314
Ban (curse). See *Excommunication*.
Baptism of John, 167 sq.; of Christ, 191 sq., 197, 262 sq.
Baptist, the. See *John*.
Baris. See *Antonia*.
Barrabbân, Jesu, concerned in disturbance under Pilate, 68; son of a rabbi, choice between him and Jesus Christ, 435 sq.
Bathîra, elders of, 20
Bethabarah, 198
Bethany, two places, 198, 367, 389
Beth-aramptha, later Julia Livia, 100
Bethesda, 282
Bethlehem, Christ's birth there, 182 sq.
Bethphage, situation of, 393
Bethsaida, two towns, 72, 252 sq., 349 sq.
Birthday of Christ, 157
'Book of Higher History,' see *Translator's Preface*; referred to 271, 424, 428 and often
Bunni, Hebrew name for *Neqdimon* in Talmud, 260

Caiaphas, high priest, 64; his advice to Sanhedrîn, 374
Cana, 180, 247 sq.; miracle at, 250 sq.
Capernaum, 180, 252, 286, 305, 340 sq., 355 sq.
Cæsarea, on the Mediterranean, 37 sq.
Cæsarea Philippi, 72; Christ's approach towards, 350
Census under the Romans, 43, 62; revolt against, 53; whether two? 155 sq.
Cephas. See *Peter*.
Channa. See *Annas*.
Chorazin, 253
Christianity the consummation of the Theocracy, 91 sq.; the First Condition of its coming, 94 sq.; the Second Condition, 103 sq.; the Third Condition, 121 sq.; the tendency to fulfil these Conditions in the ancient Community, 129 sq.; Christianity as Christ himself founded it, 200 sq. 453 sq.
Christ, portrait of, at Edessa and Rome, 157; his meeting with the Baptist, 172 sq.; his earlier history, 178 sq.; his kindred, 179 sq.; his birth in Bethlehem, 182 sq.; his descent from David, 183 sq.; his baptism, 191 sq.;

his fundamental thought, 200 sq.; his general course of labour, 210 sq.; his teaching, 216 sq.; his works of healing, 220 sq.; his higher and exceptional labours, 226 sq.; the motives of his acts, 228 sq.; his relation to the past, 233 sq., to his own immediate present, 233 sq., to his future, 238 sq.; the course of his labours until the imprisonment of the Baptist, 242 sq.; the founding of the Messianic kingdom, 272 sq.; the founding of his Community by the choice of the Twelve and their training, 296 sq.; his relation to the heathen, 347 sq.; his final decision with regard to the Hagiocracy, 376 sq.; his betrayal and his outward removal, 405 sq.; the day of the Last Supper and his crucifixion, 414 sq.; his trial, 429 sq.; his death, 437 sq.; his glorification before his death, 353 sq.; and that afterwards, 448 sq.
Christ's mother and brothers at first not members of his Community, 306; hear he is mad, 314; go to Jerusalem before him, 358; at his death, 442
Chronology of Christ's life, 149–158
Cleopas (Clopas), 305, derived from Cleopater, *ib.*
Coins, Roman-Jewish, 61 sq.
Community, the Christian (Church), its foundation by Christ, 293 sq.
Coponius, Roman governor, 65 sq.
Cross and Crucifixion, 437 sq.

Dalmanutha, 348
Daniel, Book of, its Messianic meaning, 110 sq.
David, a second expected, 105 sq.
Davidic descendants in the postexilian Israel, 109 sq., 183 sq.
Decapolis, 317, 347
Decapolitana, or Cæsarea Philippi, 72
Demons, belief in possession by, 221 sq.; Christ's treatment of, 222 sq., 314, 317 sq.
Deuteronomy, Book of, Messianic hope in, 106
Diaspora, the, 81–85
Disciples, Christ's first, 244 sq.
Disease, cure of by Christ, 222–26
Didymus. See *Thomas*.

Eagles, the Roman, 65
Edessa, portrait of Christ at, 157
Elijah, expected return of, 106, 128
Enoch, Book of, Messianic hope in, 111 sq.
Ephraim, unknown place in N.E. Judea, 375
Essenes, their attitude towards Messianic hope, 122, 130
Evangelist, Jesus the first, 216

Excommunication, the lesser, of Jesus, 292 sq., 321; of his followers, 345
Ezra, Fourth Book of [2 Esdras], Messianic ideas in, 115; idea of a Messiah son of Joseph not found in, 121

Fasting, Christ's disinclination towards, 288 sq.; Pharisees' overestimate of its virtues, 335
Feasts at Jerusalem known to have been attended by Jesus: (1) a Passover in his youth, 187 sq.; (2) a Passover at beginning of his ministry, 254 sq.; (3) probably the Feast of Tabernacles of the next year, 281 sq.; (4) the Feast of Tabernacles the next year, 357 sq.; (5) the Feast of Dedication the same year, 360, 365 sq.; (6) the Passover of the next year, 384 sq.
Feet, Apostles', washed by Christ, 414 sq.; not admitting of repetition subsequently, 417
Fig-tree, the, disappointing Christ's hopes of fruit, 400 sq.; parable of barren, 401
Forgiveness of sins, Christ's authority as to, 286 sq., 290 sq.
Fulvia, wife of Saturninus, a convert to Judaism, 83

Gadara, an ancient reading for *Gergasa*, 317
Galilee and Galileans, most prepared for the Gospel, 272 sq.
Galuth, the Israelitish exiles of the Parthian Empire, 84
Gamaliel I., rabbi, his sayings follow Shammai's in Pirqæ Aboth, 14
Gareb, older name for the hill Golgotha, 439
Garizim, the sacred vessels of Temple supposed to be buried there, 69 sq.
Gemara, 15
Gennesareth, the plain of, 254
Gerasa, another reading for *Gergasa*, 317
Gergesa, a town on east of Lake of Galilee, 317; the demoniac of, 317 sq.
Gethsemane, garden of on western slope of Olivet, 423; scene of Christ's agony, 423; various representations of scene in Gospels, 424 sq.
Golgotha. See *Gareb*.
Gospel, the, the announcement of the actual presence of the kingdom of God, 202 sq.
Governors, the Roman, 61 sq.
Gratus, Valerius, Roman Governor, 64
Greeks, their temptation of Christ, 403 sq.

Hagiocracy, the, its relation to the Roman Government, 45 sq.; to the Schools of Law and the people, 87 sq.;

to Christ, 232 sq., 286 sq., 345 sq., 372 sq., 393 sq.
Heathen, the, Christ's relation to, 235 sq.; sacrifices of at Jerusalem, 80, 82
Healing, Christ's works of, 221–26
Hellenists. See *Greeks*
Herod the Great, census under, 156; his four surviving sons, 69. [See *Erratum*]
Herod Antipas. See *Antipas.*
Herodians, adherents of the Herodean royal house, 73 sq.; plan with their enemies the Pharisees the destruction of Christ, 292; the leaven of, 349
Herodias, wife of the son of Herod living in a private station, later of Antipas, 77 sq.; procures the death of the Baptist, 200
High priests at time of Christ, 64; their garments kept in the Castle Antonia, 40, 65; in the trial of Christ, 429 sq.
Hillel, the elder, famous Rabbi: his date, 13 sq.; identical with Pollion in *Josephus*, 16–19; his descent, 19 sq.; his character, 21 sq.; his philosophy, 24 sq.; true Rabbi and Pharisee, 25 sq.; his Biblical studies, 29 sq.

Images, feeling with regard to in Jerusalem, 61 sq., 65 sq.
Isaiah, Messianic prophecies of, 105 sq., 110

Jairus, Christ restores his daughter, 320
James, the son of Alphæus, 304
James, son of Zebedee, 181; John's delicacy in not naming him, 246; becomes a disciple of Christ, 247
Jericho, Christ passes through, 335; cure of Bartimæus, 388; call of Zacchæus there, 388
Jerusalem, its privileges under the Romans, 38 sq.; Christ's public entry into, 392 sq.; his visits to, see *Feasts*
John the Baptist, his origin and fundamental thought, 160–167; his mode of carrying out his thought, 167–172; his meeting with Christ, 172–178; his end, 197 sq.; his later opinion of Christ, 327 sq.; his disciples, 172, 200, 327 sq.
John, the Apostle, a relative of Jesus, 181; of priestly extraction, 186, 433; a disciple of the Baptist, 244; first coming to Christ, 244 sq.; his Gospel, 144 sq.; value as regards the chronological order of events of Christ's life, 150, 153; records history of first period of Christ's work, 242
Joel, Messianic prophecies of, 103 sq.
Johanna, wife of Chuza, 305
Jonah, the 'sign' of, 348
Joseph, father of Jesus, lived at Nazareth, 179; died many years before Jesus came to Baptist, 180

Joseph of Arimathea, member of Sanhedrîn, and secretly friend of Jesus, 447
Josephus, Flavius, as a source for the life of Christ, 138 sq.; his attitude towards the Messianic hope, 99
Josua, son of Perachja, Rabbi, 14; Talmudists make him teacher of the child Jesus in Egypt, 142
Juchasin, Book of, a late work similar to the Aboths, 13
Juda, son of Perachja, Rabbi, 14
Judas the Gaulonite, of Gamala, founder of the school of the Zealots of the Law, 48 sq.; the *Assumption of Moses* the literary memorial of his movement, 55 sq.; his end, 60 sq.; one of his seven sons perhaps author of the *Assumption of Moses*, 61; difference of the Baptist's movement from his, 163
Judas Iscariot, his name, 303; his special office, 305; objects to waste of precious ointment, 389; the possibility of his treason, 407 sq.; his death, 409; present at Last Supper, 421; betrays Christ with a kiss, 427
Judas Kananites, Apostle, from the school of the Zealots, 300, 304
Judas of James, Apostle whose name is found in Luke in the place of Lebbæus, 304
Judeans under the Roman rule, 36 sq.; in Palestine, 85 sq.; in other countries, 81 sq.
Julia (Livia, or Julias, or Livias), subsequently called Tiberias, the town on Lake of Galilee built by Antipas, 75
Julias, town on north-east of Lake of Galilee, built by Philip on site of Bethsaida, 72. See also *Julia*

King, the Messiah, king of Israel, 208 sq.; Christ's claim to be a, 373
Kingdom of God, Christ's idea of, 201–10; possible extension without his death, 379 sq.

Law, Schools of, 41, 87 sq.; never attended by Jesus, 189; Zealots of, see *Zealots*
Lazarus of Bethany, his family, 367 sq.; John's representation of the raising of, 369 sq.; the anointing of Christ in his house, 391; the ill-will of the Hagiocracy towards, 392
Lebbæus, the Apostle, 304
Leper, Christ's cure of a, 280
Levi, publican, son of Alphæus, not an Apostle, probably an elder brother of James the Less, 304; his call, 277, 288; makes a feast for Christ, *ib.*
Livias. See *Julia*

LOG

Logos. See *Word of God*
Longinus, name of Roman centurion in *Gospel of Nicodemus*, 441
Luke, Gospel of, chronology of, 150 sq.

Machærus, fortress of, by the Dead Sea, 199; John's imprisonment there, 199; first visit in recent times to by Seetzen, *ib.*; recent visit by Tristram, 200
Magdala, home of Mary Magdalene, 253
Magedan. See *Dalmanutha*
Malchus, 427 sq.
Man, Son of. See *Messiah*
Marriage, contention about between Shammai and Hillel, 34; quibbles of Pharisees about with Jesus, 385 sq.
Mary, the mother of Jesus. See *Christ's Mother*
— — — — Clopas, 305; the mother of Jose, 305
— — — — James the Less, 305
— sister of Lazarus, 305
— Magdalene, 223, 253, 305
Matthew, the Apostle, 303; his call related like that of Levi, *ib.*
Messiah, the hope of, 103 sq.; celestialisation of, 107 sq.; his name 'Son of Man,' 113; 'Son of God,' 114; Logos, 117; Christ's adoption of name 'Son of Man,' 231
Miracles of Christ, his higher works, 226–29; the motive of, 228 sq.; at Cana, 249 sq.; the draught of fishes, 276 sq.; healing a leper, 280; at Pool of Bethesda, 282 sq.; healing a palsied man, 286 sq., a withered hand, 291 sq.; stilling the storm, 316; healing the demoniac of Gergesa, 317 sq.; restoring the daughter of Jairus, 320 sq.; curing the issue of blood, 320; raising the dead at Naïn, 324; feeding the multitude, 336 sq.; walking on the sea, 339 sq.; cure of the woman's daughter near Tyre, 347 sq.; of a deaf and dumb man, 348; of a blind man, 349; of an epileptic boy, 354; of a man born blind, 364 sq.; raising of Lazarus, 368 sq.; cure of a blind man outside Jericho, 388; the miracles of John's Gospel, 369
Mishna, 13
Moses, Book of the Assumption of, 51–61; the Messiah the messenger of God, 111
Moses, a second expected, 106
Mountain, the, near Capernaum, to which Christ resorted, 297

Nablus. See *Sichem.*
Nasî, rabbinic title, 14, 16
Nathanael of Cana, his introduction to Jesus, 247 sq., probably same as Apostle Bartholomew, 303

PUB

Nazareth, the home of the family of Jesus in his youth, 179; probably left shortly before his baptism, 180; his rejection at, 321 sq.
Nazirites, the Baptist's similarity to, 168
New Hebrew, better name for Mishna Hebrew, 21
Nicodemus, the Pharisee, his coming to Jesus by night, 260 sq.; his friend in the Sanhedrin, 375, 401. See also *Bunni. Gospel of Nicodemus* treats of events of crucifixion most fully, 444

Oil used by Jesus in some of his cures, 224

Paneas, earlier name of Cæsarea Philippi, 72; supposed statues of Christ at, 157
Parables. See *Teaching of Christ*
Passover. See *Feasts*
Peter, Simon, Apostle, comes to Jesus, 245 sq.; as Apostle, 301 sq.; meets Christ on the sea, 339 sq.; his confession, 350 sq.; at the washing of the disciples' feet, 415; his faith wavers at the end, 420
Philip, son of Herod, Tetrarch, 71–74; Christ's journey into his territory, 347
Philip, the Apostle, his coming to Jesus, 247 sq.; his characteristics, 302; appealed to by the Greeks, 403
Philo, the Alexandrine, vagueness of his Messianic hope, 99, 118
Physicians, a profession distinct from the priests, 221
Pilate, Pontius, Roman Governor, characteristics, 64 sq.; does not understand the Judeans, 65 sq.; his public works for Jerusalem, 67; proposes to put golden shields in royal castle at Jerusalem, 68 sq.; misunderstanding with Samaritans, 69 sq.; trial of Christ before, 429 sq.
Pirqæ Aboth, earliest collection of sayings of the chief teachers of the Great Synagogue, 13
Pollion, Pharisee, 16 sq.; probably identical with Hillel, 19
Prætorium, residence of the Roman Governor in Jerusalem, 39; Christ led into, 433
Priests in Jerusalem at time of Baptist, 162
Prophet, the great anonymous, 106, 127; the expectation of a greater, 123–129; revival of prophetic spirit the third condition of the Messianic consummation, 126 sq.
Proselytes, the desire to make them chiefly felt by Pharisees, 85 sq.
Publicans, tax-collectors under the Romans, 54

PUR

Purim, feast of, might be held a day earlier, 419

Qabbala, oral tradition of the teaching of men of the Great Synagogue, 14
Quirinius, P. Sulp., Præses of Syria, 43 sq.; census of, 44 sq.; 155 sq.

Rabban, rabbinical title, 19
Rabbi, 232; title used at time of Christ, *ib. note.*
Rabbinic school, 11 sq.
Rabbôni, difference of from rabbi, 232
Religion, the perfect true, the way in which it can come, 209 sq., 210 sq.; its miracles, 226 sq.
Rome, Judeans and Judean community there, 82 sq.; the direct rule of over Juda, 36 sq.
Roman Governors of Palestine, their character and prerogatives, 36–42
Rufus Annius, Roman Governor, 64

Sabbath, Jesus cures a demoniac on, 278 sq.; Judeans charge him with breaking it, 283 sq.; his disciples pluck corn on, 289 sq.; he complains of injustice of Scribes for condemning his conduct, 362 sq.; cures a man born blind on, 364 sq.; not a valid pretext for a sentence against him, 373 sq.; 431
Sacrifices for Cæsar at Jerusalem, 40
Saddok, a Zealot of the Law, and supporter of Judas the Gaulonite, 48
Salim, a place near which John baptised, probably in S.E. Judah, and the same as Tristram's *Rug'ûm Salâmeh*, 198 sq.
Salome, Herod's sister, 71
Salome, daughter of Herodias, 72
Salome, mother of James and John, 181; her request for her two sons, 387; at the cross, 442
Samaria, under the Romans, 37; its contentions with the Judeans, 63; the woman of, 264 sq.
Sanhedrin, or Synedrion, its greater freedom under the Romans, 38, 41
Sayings, Collected, Translator's Preface, 218, 309, 424 and often
Scribes, or Biblical Scholars, the boy Jesus in the Temple before them, 189; Abba a title used by them, 232; dispute his right to forgive sins, 286 sq.
Scriptures, Sacred, interpretation of, 29 sq.; schools for study of, 87 sq.; Christ's use of, 233 sq.
Sepher Toledoth Jeshua Ha-Nossri, 142

VIT

Sepphoris (Diocæsarea), restored by Antipas, 75 sq.
'Sermon on the Mount,' 308 sq.
Seventy disciples of Christ, only mentioned by Luke, 299; sent forth according to Luke on trial-journeys like the Twelve, 326
Shammai, Rabbi, contemporary and opponent of Hillel, 13 sq.; sayings of, 28 sq.; pupil and rival of Hillel, 33 sq.
Sichem, the present city Nablus, 265
Sidon, Christ's journey thither, 347
Simon of Cyrene, 440
Simon the Leper, father of Lazarus, 368; feast at his house, 387
Simon. See *Peter.*
Simon the Magian, 70
Solomon's Porch in the Temple where Christ taught, 360
'Son of God,' as applied to Christ, 114
Sources, historical, for life of Christ, heathen, 137 sq.; Jewish, 138 sq.; Christian, 142–149
Ssabians, or Mandæans, later disciples of the Baptist, 160
'*Sthirna* (or *dhărnā*) *sitting*,' custom in India, 66
Sun, eclipse of at death of Christ, 444
Supper, Last, of Christ, 414 sq.; on 13th of Nisan, 417 sq.; Iscariot present at, 421
Sychar, unknown place near Nablus, 264 sq.

Talmud, references in to Christ, 141 sq.
Taxes, under the Romans, 42; immunity from, 356 sq.; of the Temple, 356
Teaching, Christ's manner of, 216 sq., 310 sq.,
Temple, the Treasury of, 360; Solomon's Porch, 360; the boy Jesus there, 187; Christ's cleansing of, 254 sq.; veil of, rent at crucifixion, 444
Temptation, the history of Christ's, 270 sq.; Christ's to go to the Hellenists 403 sq.
Thaddæus. See *Lebbæus*
Thomas, the Apostle, surnamed Didymus, 303
Tiberias, city, its founding by Antipas, 75
Tirithana, place at the foot of Gerizim in Samaria, 69
Transfiguration, of Christ, 353 sq. John's treatment of, 402 sq.
Twelve, the Apostles, 299–306; the practical training of, 315 sq.; only one of present at crucifixion, 442
Tyre, Christ's journey thither, 347

Veronica, supposed to be woman with issue of blood, 321
Vitellius, L., Syrian governor, 70, 79

WOM

Woman taken in adultery, 366
Women, the, of Christ's society, 305
'Word of God,' Messianic name, 116 sq.
Words of Christ not in four Gospels, 218
Works of Christ, two kinds of, 219 sq.
See *Miracles*

ZEC

Zacchæus, rich tax-gatherer at Jericho, 388
Zealots of the Law, 49 sq.
Zebedee, father of James and John, 181 sq.
Zechariah, as Messianic prophet, 108 sq., 394

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
LONDON, *November* 1882.

GENERAL LISTS OF WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

MESSRS. LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

HISTORY, POLITICS, HISTORICAL MEMOIRS, &c.

History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815 to the year 1841. By SPENCER WALPOLE. 3 vols. 8vo. £2. 14*s.*

History of England in the 18th Century. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. 4 vols. 8vo. 1700–1784, £3. 12*s.*

The History of England from the Accession of James II. By the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY.
STUDENT'S EDITION, 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 12*s.*
PEOPLE'S EDITION, 4 vols. cr. 8vo. 16*s.*
CABINET EDITION, 8 vols. post 8vo. 48*s.*
LIBRARY EDITION, 5 vols. 8vo. £4.

The Complete Works of Lord Macaulay. Edited by Lady TREVELYAN.
CABINET EDITION, 16 vols. crown 8vo. price £4. 16*s.*
LIBRARY EDITION, 8 vols. 8vo. Portrait, price £5. 5*s.*

Lord Macaulay's Critical and Historical Essays.
CHEAP EDITION, crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
STUDENT'S EDITION, crown 8vo. 6*s.*
PEOPLE'S EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 8*s.*
CABINET EDITION, 4 vols. 24*s.*
LIBRARY EDITION, 3 vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

The History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A.
POPULAR EDITION, 12 vols. crown, £2. 2*s.*
CABINET EDITION, 12 vols. crown, £3. 12*s.*

The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18*s.*

The English in America; Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas. By J. A. DOYLE, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. 8vo. Map, 18*s.*

Journal of the Reigns of King George IV. and King William IV. By the late C. C. F. GREVILLE, Esq. Edited by H. REEVE, Esq. Fifth Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. price 36*s.*

The Life of Napoleon III. derived from State Records, Unpublished Family Correspondence, and Personal Testimony. By BLANCHARD JERROLD. With numerous Portraits and Facsimiles. 4 vols. 8vo. £3. 18*s.*

The Early History of Charles James Fox. By the Right Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 6*s.*

Selected Speeches of the Earl of Beaconsfield, K.G. With Introduction and Notes, by T. E. KEBBEL, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait, 32*s.*

The Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III. 1760–1870. By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B. D.C.L. Seventh Edition. 3 vols. cr. 8vo. 18*s.*

Democracy in Europe; a History. By Sir THOMAS ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B. D.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. 32*s.*

Introductory Lectures on Modern History delivered in 1841 and 1842. By the late THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D. 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

History of Civilisation in England and France, Spain and Scotland. By HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE. 3 vols. crown 8vo. *24s.*

Lectures on the History of England from the Earliest Times to the Death of King Edward II. By W. LONGMAN, F.S.A. Maps and Illustrations. 8vo. *15s.*

History of the Life & Times of Edward III. By W. LONGMAN, F.S.A. With 9 Maps, 8 Plates, and 16 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. *28s.*

Historic Winchester; England's First Capital. By A. R. BRAMSTON and A. C. LEROY. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

The Historical Geography of Europe. By E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L. LL.D. Second Edition, with 65 Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. *31s. 6d.*

History of England under the Duke of Buckingham and Charles I. 1624–1628. By S. R. GARDINER, LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. Maps, price *24s.*

The Personal Government of Charles I. from the Death of Buckingham to the Declaration in favour of Ship Money, 1628–1637. By S. R. GARDINER, LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. *24s.*

The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles I. 1637–1649. By S. R. GARDINER, LL.D. VOLS. I. & II. 1637–1642. 2 vols. 8vo. *28s.*

A Student's Manual of the History of India from the Earliest Period to the Present. By Col. MEADOWS TAYLOR, M.R.A.S. Third Thousand. Crown 8vo. Maps, *7s. 6d.*

Outline of English History, B.C. 55–A.D. 1880. By S. R. GARDINER, LL.D. With 96 Woodcuts Fcp. 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

Waterloo Lectures; a Study of the Campaign of 1815. By Col. C. C. CHESNEY, R.E. 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

The Oxford Reformers—John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More; a History of their Fellow-Work. By F. SEEBOHM. 8vo. *14s.*

History of the Romans under the Empire. By Dean MERIVALE, D.D. 8 vols. post 8vo. *48s.*

General History of Rome from B.C. 753 to A.D. 476. By Dean MERIVALE, D.D. Crown 8vo. Maps, price *7s. 6d.*

The Fall of the Roman Republic; a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. By Dean MERIVALE, D.D. 12mo. *7s. 6d.*

The History of Rome. By WILHELM IHNE. 5 vols. 8vo. price £3. *17s.*

Carthage and the Carthaginians. By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A. Second Edition; Maps, Plans, &c. Crown 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

History of Ancient Egypt. By G. RAWLINSON, M.A. With Map and Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. *63s.*

The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy; or, a History of the Sassanians. By G. RAWLINSON, M.A. With Map and 95 Illustrations. 8vo. *28s.*

The History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. 2 vols. crown 8vo. *16s.*

History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. 2 vols. crown 8vo. *16s.*

The History of Philosophy, from Thales to Comte. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. Fifth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. *32s.*

A History of Classical Latin Literature. By G. A. SIMCOX, M.A. Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. *32s.*

A History of Classical Greek Literature. By the Rev. J. P. MAHAFFY, M.A. Crown 8vo. VOL. I. Poets, *7s. 6d.* VOL. II. Prose Writers, *7s. 6d.*

Witt's Myths of Hellas, or Greek Tales Told in German. Translated into English by F. M. YOUNGHUSBAND. With a Preface by A. SIDGWICK, M.A. C.C. Coll. Oxon. Crown 8vo. [*Nearly ready.*

Zeller's Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. New Edition revised. Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

Zeller's Socrates & the Socratic Schools. Translated by the Rev. O. J. REICHEL, M.A. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Zeller's Plato & the Older Academy. Translated by S. FRANCES ALLEYNE and ALFRED GOODWIN, B.A. Crown 8vo. 18*s.*

Zeller's Pre-Socratic Schools; a History of Greek Philosophy from the Earliest Period to the time of Socrates. Translated by SARAH F. ALLEYNE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 30*s.*

Epochs of Modern History. Edited by C. COLBECK, M.A.

Church's Beginning of the Middle Ages. price 2*s.* 6*d.*
Cox's Crusades, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Creighton's Age of Elizabeth, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Gairdner's Lancaster and York, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Gardiner's Puritan Revolution, 2*s.* 6*d.*
——— Thirty Years' War, 2*s.* 6*d.*
——— (Mrs.) French Revolution, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Hale's Fall of the Stuarts, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Johnson's Normans in Europe, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Longman's Frederic the Great, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Ludlow's War of American Independence, price 2*s.* 6*d.*
M'Carthy's Epoch of Reform, 1830–1850. price 2*s.* 6*d.*
Morris's Age of Anne, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Seebohm's Protestant Revolution, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Stubbs' Early Plantagenets, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Warburton's Edward III. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Epochs of Ancient History. Edited by the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. M.A. & C. SANKEY, M.A.

Beesly's Gracchi, Marius and Sulla, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Capes's Age of the Antonines, 2*s.* 6*d.*
——— Early Roman Empire, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Cox's Athenian Empire, 2*s.* 6*d.*
——— Greeks & Persians, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Curteis's Macedonian Empire, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Ihne's Rome to its Capture by the Gauls, price 2*s.* 6*d.*
Merivale's Roman Triumvirates, 2*s.* 6*d.*
Sankey's Spartan & Theban Supremacies, price 2*s.* 6*d.*
Smith's Rome and Carthage, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Creighton's Shilling History of England, introductory to 'Epochs of English History.' Fcp. 1*s.*

Epochs of English History. Edited by the Rev. MANDELL CREIGHTON, M.A. In One Volume. Fcp. 8vo. 5*s.*

Browning's Modern England, 1820–1874, 9*d.*
Creighton's (Mrs.) England a Continental Power, 1066–1216, 9*d.*
Creighton's (Rev. M.) Tudors and the Reformation, 1485–1603, 9*d.*
Gardiner's (Mrs.) Struggle against Absolute Monarchy, 1603–1688, 9*d.*
Rowley's Rise of the People, 1215–1485, 9*d.*
——— Settlement of the Constitution, 1689–1784, 9*d.*
Tancock's England during the American and European Wars, 1765–1820, 9*d.*
York-Powell's Early England to the Conquest, 1*s.*

The Student's Manual of Ancient History; the Political History, Geography and Social State of the Principal Nations of Antiquity. By W. COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D. Cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Student's Manual of Modern History; the Rise and Progress of the Principal European Nations. By W. COOKE TAYLOR, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS.

Reminiscences chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement. By the Rev. THOMAS MOZLEY, M.A. Second Edition, with New Preface. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 18*s.*

Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ; being a History of his Religious Opinions by Cardinal NEWMAN. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Thomas Carlyle, a History of the first Forty Years of his Life, 1795 to 1835. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. With 2 Portraits and 4 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo. 32*s.*

Reminiscences. By THOMAS CARLYLE. Edited by J. A. FROUDE, M.A. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 18*s.*

Life of Sir William Rowan Hamilton, Kt. LL.D. D.C.L. M.R.I.A. &c. Including Selections from his Poems, Correspondence, and Miscellaneous Writings. By the Rev. R. P. GRAVES, M.A. VOL. I. 8vo. 15*s.*

The Marriages of the Bonapartes. By the Hon. D. A. BINGHAM. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 21*s.*

Recollections of the Last Half-Century. By COUNT ORSI. With a Portrait of Napoleon III. and 4 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Autobiography. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Felix Mendelssohn's Letters, translated by Lady WALLACE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 5*s.* each.

The Correspondence of Robert Southey with Caroline Bowles. Edited by EDWARD DOWDEN, LL.D. 8vo. Portrait, 14*s.*

The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay. By the Right Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P.

LIBRARY EDITION, 2 vols. 8vo. 36*s.*
CABINET EDITION, 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12*s.*
POPULAR EDITION, 1 vol. crown 8vo. 6*s.*

William Law, Nonjuror and Mystic. By the Rev. J. H. OVERTON, M.A. 8vo. 15*s.*

James Mill; a Biography. By A. BAIN, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

John Stuart Mill; a Criticism, with Personal Recollections. By A. BAIN, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

A Dictionary of General Biography. By W. L. R. CATES. Third Edition. 8vo. 28*s.*

Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. By J. O. HALLIWELL-PHILLIPPS, F.R.S. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Biographical Studies. By the late WALTER BAGEHOT, M.A. 8vo. 12*s.*

Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography. By the Right Hon. Sir J. STEPHEN, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Cæsar; a Sketch. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. With Portrait and Map. 8vo. 16*s.*

Life of the Duke of Wellington. By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Crown 8vo. Portrait, 6*s.*

Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock, K.C.B. By JOHN CLARK MARSHMAN. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland. By W. E. H. LECKY, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Memoir of Augustus De Morgan, with Selections from his Letters. By his Wife, SOPHIA ELIZABETH DE MORGAN. 8vo. with Portrait, 14*s.*

MENTAL and POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

Comte's System of Positive Polity, or Treatise upon Sociology. By various Translators. 4 vols. 8vo. £4.

De Tocqueville's Democracy in America, translated by H. REEVE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16*s.*

Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind. By JAMES MILL. With Notes, Illustrative and Critical. 2 vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

On Representative Government. By JOHN STUART MILL. Crown 8vo. 2*s.*

On Liberty. By JOHN STUART MILL. Crown 8vo. *1s. 4d.*

Principles of Political Economy. By JOHN STUART MILL. 2 vols. 8vo. *30s.* or 1 vol. crown 8vo. *5s.*

Essays on some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. *6s. 6d.*

Utilitarianism. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. *5s.*

The Subjection of Women. By JOHN STUART MILL. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy. By JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. *16s.*

A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive. By JOHN STUART MILL. 2 vols. 8vo. *25s.*

Dissertations and Discussions. By JOHN STUART MILL. 4 vols. 8vo. *£2. 6s. 6d.*

A Systematic View of the Science of Jurisprudence. By SHELDON AMOS, M.A. 8vo. *18s.*

Path and Goal; a Discussion on the Elements of Civilisation and the Conditions of Happiness. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D. M.A. 8vo. price *12s. 6d.*

Sir Travers Twiss on the Rights and Duties of Nations, considered as Independent Communities, in Time of War. Second Edition. 8vo. *21s.*

A Primer of the English Constitution and Government. By S. AMOS, M.A. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

Fifty Years of the English Constitution, 1830–1880. By SHELDON AMOS, M.A. Crown 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

Francis Bacon's Promus of Formularies and Elegancies, illustrated by Passages from SHAKESPEARE. By Mrs. H. POTT. With a Preface by the Rev. E. A. ABBOTT, D.D. 8vo. *16s.*

Principles of Economical Philosophy. By H. D. MACLEOD, M.A. Second Edition, in 2 vols. VOL. I. 8vo. *15s.* VOL. II. PART I. *12s.*

Lord Bacon's Works, collected & edited by R. L. ELLIS, M.A. J. SPEDDING, M.A. and D. D. HEATH. 7 vols. 8vo. *£3. 13s. 6d.*

Letters and Life of Francis Bacon, including all his Occasional Works. Collected and edited, with a Commentary, by J. SPEDDING. 7 vols. 8vo. *£4. 4s.*

The Institutes of Justinian; with English Introduction, Translation, and Notes. By T. C. SANDARS, M.A. 8vo. *18s.*

The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle, translated into English by R. WILLIAMS, B.A. Crown 8vo. price *7s. 6d.*

Aristotle's Politics, Books I. III. IV. (VII.) Greek Text, with an English Translation by W. E. BOLLAND, M.A. and Short Essays by A. LANG, M.A. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

The Ethics of Aristotle; with Essays and Notes. By Sir A. GRANT, Bart. LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo. *32s*

Bacon's Essays, with Annotations. By R. WHATELY, D.D. 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

An Introduction to Logic. By WILLIAM H. STANLEY MONCK, M.A. Prof. of Moral Philos. Univ. of Dublin. Crown 8vo. *5s.*

Picture Logic; an Attempt to Popularise the Science of Reasoning. By A. J. SWINBURNE, B.A. Post 8vo. *5s.*

Elements of Logic. By R. WHATELY, D.D. 8vo. *10s. 6d.* Crown 8vo. *4s. 6d.*

Elements of Rhetoric. By R. WHATELY, D.D. 8vo. *10s. 6d.* Crown 8vo. *4s. 6d.*

The Senses and the Intellect. By A. BAIN, LL.D. 8vo. *15s.*

The Emotions and the Will. By A. BAIN, LL.D. 8vo. *15s.*

Mental and Moral Science; a Compendium of Psychology and Ethics. By A. BAIN, LL.D. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

An Outline of the Necessary Laws of Thought; a Treatise on Pure and Applied Logic. By W. THOMSON, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Essays in Political and Moral Philosophy. By T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE, Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

On the Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion. By the late Sir G. C. LEWIS, Bart. 8vo. price 14*s.*

Hume's Philosophical Works: Edited, with Notes, &c. by T. H. GREEN, M.A. and the Rev. T. H. GROSE, M.A. 4 vols. 8vo. 56*s.* Or separately, Essays, 2 vols. 28*s.* Treatise on Human Nature, 2 vols. 28*s.*

MISCELLANEOUS & CRITICAL WORKS.

Studies of Modern Mind and Character at Several European Epochs. By JOHN WILSON. 8vo. 12*s.*

Selected Essays, chiefly from Contributions to the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews. By A. HAYWARD, Q.C. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 12*s.*

Short Studies on Great Subjects. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 18*s.* FOURTH SERIES, 8vo. 12*s.*

Literary Studies. By the late WALTER BAGEHOT, M.A. Second Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. Portrait, 28*s.*

Manual of English Literature, Historical and Critical. By T. ARNOLD, M.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Poetry and Prose; Illustrative Passages from English Authors from the Anglo-Saxon Period to the Present Time. Edited by T. ARNOLD, M.A. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

The Wit and Wisdom of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, collected from his Writings and Speeches. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

The Wit and Wisdom of the Rev. Sydney Smith. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lord Macaulay's Miscellaneous Writings:—
LIBRARY EDITION, 2 vols. 8vo. 21*s.*
PEOPLE'S EDITION, 1 vol. cr. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Lord Macaulay's Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches. Student's Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*
Cabinet Edition, including Indian Penal Code, Lays of Ancient Rome, and other Poems. 4 vols. post 8vo. 24*s.*

Speeches of Lord Macaulay, corrected by Himself. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Selections from the Writings of Lord Macaulay. Edited, with Notes, by the Right Hon. G. O. TREVELYAN, M.P. Crown. 8vo. 6*s.*

Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, D.D. late Head Master of Rugby School. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Realities of Irish Life. By W. STEUART TRENCH. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* Sunbeam Edition, 6*d.*

Evenings with the Skeptics; or, Free Discussion on Free Thinkers. By JOHN OWEN, Rector of East Anstey, Devon. 2 vols. 8vo. 32*s.*

Outlines of Primitive Belief among the Indo-European Races. By CHARLES F. KEARY, M.A. 8vo. 18*s.*

Language & Languages. A Revised Edition of Chapters on Language and Families of Speech. By F. W. FARRAR, D.D. F.R.S. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Grammar of Elocution. By JOHN MILLARD, Elocution Master in the City of London School. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Selected Essays on Language, Mythology, and Religion. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. K.M. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16*s.*

Lectures on the Science of Language. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. K.M. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16*s.*

Chips from a German Workshop; Essays on the Science of Religion, and on Mythology, Traditions & Customs. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. K.M. 4 vols. 8vo. £1. 16*s.*

India, What Can it Teach Us? A Course of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. K.M. 8vo. [*In the press.*

The Essays and Contributions of A. K. H. B. Uniform Cabinet Editions in crown 8vo.

Autumn Holidays, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths, price 3*s.* 6*d.*
Commonplace Philosopher, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Counsel and Comfort, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Critical Essays, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Graver Thoughts. Three Series, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.
Landscapes, Churches, and Moralities, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Leisure Hours in Town, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Lessons of Middle Age, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Our Little Life, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Present Day Thoughts, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Recreations of a Country Parson, Three Series, 3*s.* 6*d.* each.
Seaside Musings, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Sunday Afternoons, 3*s.* 6*d.*

DICTIONARIES and OTHER BOOKS of REFERENCE.

English Synonymes. By E. J. WHATELY. Edited by R. WHATELY, D.D. Fcp. 8vo. 3*s.*

Roget's Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases, classified and arranged so as to facilitate the expression of Ideas, and assist in Literary Composition. Re-edited by the Author's Son, J. L. ROGET. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Handbook of the English Language. By R. G. LATHAM, M.A. M.D. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Contanseau's Practical Dictionary of the French and English Languages. Post 8vo. price 7*s.* 6*d.*

Contanseau's Pocket Dictionary, French and English, abridged from the Practical Dictionary by the Author. Square 18mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

A Practical Dictionary of the German and English Languages. By Rev. W. L. BLACKLEY, M.A. & Dr. C. M. FRIEDLÄNDER. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

A New Pocket Dictionary of the German and English Languages. By F. W. LONGMAN, Ball. Coll. Oxford. Square 18mo. 5*s.*

Becker's Gallus; Roman Scenes of the Time of Augustus. Translated by the Rev. F. METCALFE, M.A. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Becker's Charicles; Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. Translated by the Rev. F. METCALFE, M.A. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Dictionary of Roman and Greek Antiquities. With 2,000 Woodcuts illustrative of the Arts and Life of the Greeks and Romans. By A. RICH, B.A. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Greek-English Lexicon. By H. G. LIDDELL, D.D. Dean of Christchurch, and R. SCOTT, D.D. Dean of Rochester. Crown 4to. 36*s.*

Liddell & Scott's Lexicon, Greek and English, abridged for Schools. Square 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

An English-Greek Lexicon, containing all the Greek Words used by Writers of good authority. By C. D. YONGE, M.A. 4to. 21*s.* School Abridgment, square 12mo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

A Latin-English Dictionary. By JOHN T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. and J. E. RIDDLE, M.A. Oxon. Sixth Edition, revised. Quarto 21*s.*

White's Concise Latin-English Dictionary, for the use of University Students. Royal 8vo. 12*s.*

M'Culloch's Dictionary of Commerce and Commercial Navigation. Re-edited (1882), with a Supplement containing the most recent Information, by A. J. WILSON. With 48 Maps, Charts, and Plans. Medium 8vo. 63*s.*

Keith Johnston's General Dictionary of Geography, Descriptive, Physical, Statistical, and Historical; a complete Gazetteer of the World. Medium 8vo. 42*s.*

The Public Schools Atlas of Ancient Geography, in 28 entirely new Coloured Maps. Edited by the Rev. G. BUTLER, M.A. Imperial 8vo. or imperial 4to. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Public Schools Atlas of Modern Geography, in 31 entirely new Coloured Maps. Edited by the Rev. G. BUTLER, M.A. Uniform, 5*s.*

ASTRONOMY and METEOROLOGY.

Outlines of Astronomy. By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart. M.A. Latest Edition, with Plates and Diagrams. Square crown 8vo. 12*s.*

The Moon, and the Condition and Configurations of its Surface. By E. NEISON, F.R.A.S. With 26 Maps and 5 Plates. Medium 8vo. price 31*s.* 6*d.*

Air and Rain; the Beginnings of a Chemical Climatology. By R. A. SMITH, F.R.S. 8vo. 24*s.*

Celestial Objects for Common Telescopes. By the Rev. T. W. WEBB, M.A. Fourth Edition, adapted to the Present State of Sidereal Science; Map, Plate, Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

The Sun; Ruler, Light, Fire, and Life of the Planetary System. By R. A. PROCTOR, B.A. With Plates & Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 14*s.*

Proctor's Orbs Around Us; a Series of Essays on the Moon & Planets, Meteors & Comets, the Sun & Coloured Pairs of Suns. With Chart and Diagrams. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's Other Worlds than Ours; The Plurality of Worlds Studied under the Light of Recent Scientific Researches. With 14 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor on the Moon; her Motions, Aspects, Scenery, and Physical Condition. With Plates, Charts, Woodcuts, and Lunar Photographs. Crown 8vo. 10*s.*6*d.*

Proctor's Universe of Stars; Presenting Researches into and New Views respecting the Constitution of the Heavens. Second Edition, with 22 Charts and 22 Diagrams. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's New Star Atlas, for the Library, the School, and the Observatory, in 12 Circular Maps (with 2 Index Plates). Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Proctor's Larger Star Atlas, for the Library, in Twelve Circular Maps, with Introduction and 2 Index Plates. Folio, 15*s.* or Maps only, 12*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's Essays on Astronomy. A Series of Papers on Planets and Meteors, the Sun and Sun-surrounding Space, Stars and Star Cloudlets. With 10 Plates and 24 Woodcuts. 8vo. price 12*s.*

Proctor's Transits of Venus; a Popular Account of Past and Coming Transits from the First Observed by Horrocks in 1639 to the Transit of 2012. Fourth Edition, including Suggestions respecting the approaching Transit in December 1882; with 20 Lithographic Plates (12 Coloured) and 38 Illustrations engraved on Wood. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's Studies of Venus-Transits; an Investigation of the Circumstances of the Transits of Venus in 1874 and 1882. With 7 Diagrams and 10 Plates. 8vo. 5*s.*

NATURAL HISTORY and PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

Ganot's Elementary Treatise on Physics, for the use of Colleges and Schools. Translated by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. Tenth Edition. With 4 Coloured Plates and 844 Woodcuts. Large crown 8vo. 15*s.*

Ganot's Natural Philosophy for General Readers and Young Persons. Translated by E. ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. Fourth Edition; with 2 Plates and 471 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Professor Helmholtz' Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects. Translated and edited by EDMUND ATKINSON, Ph.D. F.C.S. With a Preface by Prof. TYNDALL, F.R.S. and 68 Woodcuts. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 15*s.* or separately, 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

Arnott's Elements of Physics or Natural Philosophy. Seventh Edition, edited by A. BAIN, LL.D. and A. S. TAYLOR, M.D. F.R.S. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Correlation of Physical Forces. By the Hon. Sir W. R. GROVE, F.R.S. &c. Sixth Edition, revised and augmented. 8vo. 15*s.*

A Treatise on Magnetism, General and Terrestrial. By H. LLOYD, D.D. D.C.L. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d*

The Mathematical and other Tracts of the late James M'Cullagh, F.T.C.D. Prof. of Nat. Philos. in the Univ. of Dublin. Edited by the Rev. J. H. JELLETT, B.D. and the Rev. S. HAUGHTON, M.D. 8vo. 15*s.*

Elementary Treatise on the Wave-Theory of Light. By H. LLOYD, D.D. D.C.L. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Fragments of Science. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. Sixth Edition. 2 vols. crown 8vo. 16*s.*

Heat a Mode of Motion. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 12*s.*

Sound. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. Fourth Edition, including Recent Researches. [*In the press.*

Essays on the Floating-Matter of the Air in relation to Putrefaction and Infection. By JOHN TYNDALL, F.R.S. With 24 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Professor Tyndall's Lectures on Light, delivered in America in 1872 and 1873. With Portrait, Plate & Diagrams. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Professor Tyndall's Lessons in Electricity at the Royal Institution, 1875-6. With 58 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Professor Tyndall's Notes of a Course of Seven Lectures on Electrical Phenomena and Theories, delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* sewed, 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

Professor Tyndall's Notes of a Course of Nine Lectures on Light, delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* swd., 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

Six Lectures on Physical Geography, delivered in 1876, with some Additions. By the Rev. SAMUEL HAUGHTON, F.R.S. M.D. D.C.L. With 23 Diagrams. 8vo. 15*s.*

An Introduction to the Systematic Zoology and Morphology of Vertebrate Animals. By A. MACALISTER, M.D. With 28 Diagrams. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Text-Books of Science, Mechanical and Physical, adapted for the use of Artisans and of Students in Public and Science Schools. Small 8vo. with Woodcuts, &c.

Abney's Photography, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Anderson's (Sir John) Strength of Materials, price 3*s.* 6*d.*
Armstrong's Organic Chemistry, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Ball's Elements of Astronomy, 6*s.*
Barry's Railway Appliances, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Bauerman's Systematic Mineralogy, 6*s.*
Bloxam & Huntington's Metals, 5*s.*
Glazebrook's Physical Optics, 6*s.*
Goodeve's Mechanics, 3*s.* 6d.
Gore's Electro-Metallurgy, 6*s.*
Griffin's Algebra and Trigonometry, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Jenkin's Electricity and Magnetism, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Maxwell's Theory of Heat, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Merrifield's Technical Arithmetic, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Miller's Inorganic Chemistry, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Preece & Sivewright's Telegraphy, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Rutley's Study of Rocks, 4*s.* 6*d.*
Shelley's Workshop Appliances, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Thomé's Structural and Physical Botany, 6*s*
Thorpe's Quantitative Analysis, 4*s.* 6*d.*
Thorpe & Muir's Qualitative Analysis, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Tilden's Chemical Philosophy, 3*s.* 6*d.*
Unwin's Machine Design, 6*s.*
Watson's Plane and Solid Geometry, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Experimental Physiology, its Benefits to Mankind; with an Address on Unveiling the Statue of William Harvey at Folkestone August 1881. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. &c. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

The Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of the Vertebrate Animals. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. With 1,472 Woodcuts. 3 vols. 8vo. £3. 13*s.* 6*d.*

Homes without Hands; a Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to their Principle of Construction. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. With about 140 Vignettes on Wood. 8vo. 14*s.*

Wood's Strange Dwellings; a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands.' With Frontispiece and 60 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* Sunbeam Edition, 4to. 6*d.*

Wood's Insects at Home; a Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. 8vo. Woodcuts, 14*s.*

Common British Insects, abridged from *Insects at Home.* By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. F.L.S. Crown 8vo. with numerous Illustrations.

Wood's Insects Abroad; a Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits, and Transformations. 8vo. Woodcuts, 14*s.*

Wood's Out of Doors; a Selection of Original Articles on Practical Natural History. With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Wood's Bible Animals; a description of every Living Creature mentioned in the Scriptures. With 112 Vignettes. 8vo. 14*s.*

The Sea and its Living Wonders. By Dr. G. HARTWIG. 8vo. with many Illustrations, 10*s.* 6*d.*

Hartwig's Tropical World. With about 200 Illustrations. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Hartwig's Polar World; a Description of Man and Nature in the Arctic and Antarctic Regions of the Globe. Maps, Plates & Woodcuts. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* Sunbeam Edition, 6*d.*

Hartwig's Subterranean World. With Maps and Woodcuts. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Hartwig's Aerial World; a Popular Account of the Phenomena and Life of the Atmosphere. Map, Plates, Woodcuts. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Familiar History of Birds. By E. STANLEY, D.D. Revised and enlarged, with 160 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Rural Bird Life; Essays on Ornithology, with Instructions for Preserving Objects relating to that Science. By CHARLES DIXON. With Coloured Frontispiece and 44 Woodcuts by G. Pearson. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Country Pleasures; the Chronicle of a Year, chiefly in a Garden. By GEORGE MILNER. Second Edition, with Vignette. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Rocks Classified and Described. By BERNHARD VON COTTA. An English Translation, by P. H. LAWRENCE, with English, German, and French Synonymes. Post 8vo. 14*s.*

The Geology of England and Wales; a Concise Account of the Lithological Characters, Leading Fossils, and Economic Products of the Rocks. By H. B. WOODWARD, F.G.S. Crown 8vo. Map & Woodcuts, 14*s.*

Keller's Lake Dwellings of Switzerland, and other Parts of Europe. Translated by JOHN E. LEE, F.S.A. F.G.S. With 206 Illustrations. 2 vols. royal 8vo. 42*s.*

Heer's Primæval World of Switzerland. Edited by JAMES HEYWOOD, M.A. F.R.S. With Map, Plates & Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo. 12*s.*

The Puzzle of Life; a Short History of Praehistoric Vegetable and Animal Life on the Earth. By A. NICOLS, F.R.G.S. With 12 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Bronze Implements, Arms, and Ornaments of Great Britain and Ireland. By JOHN EVANS, D.C.L. LL.D. F.R.S. With 540 Illustrations. 8vo. 25*s.*

The Origin of Civilisation, and the Primitive Condition of Man. By Sir J. LUBBOCK, Bart. M.P. F.R.S. Fourth Edition, enlarged. 8vo. Woodcuts, 18*s.*

Proctor's Light Science for Leisure Hours; Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects, Natural Phenomena, &c. 2 vols. cr. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* ea.

Brande's Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art. Re-edited by the Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. M.A. 3 vols. medium 8vo. 63*s.*

Hullah's Course of Lectures on the History of Modern Music. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Hullah's Second Course of Lectures on the Transition Period of Musical History. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Plants; the Specific Character, Description, Culture, History, &c. of all Plants found in Great Britain. With 12,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42*s.*

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Gardening; the Theory and Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture & Landscape Gardening. With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21*s.*

De Caisne & Le Maout's Descriptive and Analytical Botany. Translated by Mrs. HOOKER; edited and arranged by J. D. HOOKER, M.D. With 5,500 Woodcuts. Imperial 8vo. price 31*s.* 6*d.*

Rivers's Orchard-House; or, the Cultivation of Fruit Trees under Glass. Sixteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. with 25 Woodcuts, 5*s.*

The Rose Amateur's Guide. By THOMAS RIVERS. Latest Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

Elementary Botany, Theoretical and Practical; a Text-Book for Students. By H. EDMONDS B.Sc. With 312 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 2*s.*

CHEMISTRY and PHYSIOLOGY.

Experimental Chemistry for Junior Students. By J. E. REYNOLDS, M.D. F.R.S. Prof. of Chemistry, Univ. of Dublin. Fcp. 8vo. PART I. *1s. 6d.* PART II. *2s. 6d.*

Practical Chemistry; the Principles of Qualitative Analysis. By W. A. TILDEN, F.C.S. Fcp. 8vo. *1s. 6d.*

Miller's Elements of Chemistry, Theoretical and Practical. Re-edited, with Additions, by H. MACLEOD, F.C.S. 3 vols. 8vo.

PART I. CHEMICAL PHYSICS. *16s.*

PART II. INORGANIC CHEMISTRY, *24s.*

PART III. ORGANIC CHEMISTRY, *31s. 6d.*

An Introduction to the Study of Inorganic Chemistry. By W. ALLEN MILLER, M.D. LL.D. late Professor of Chemistry, King's College, London. With 71 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. *3s. 6d.*

Annals of Chemical Medicine; including the Application of Chemistry to Physiology, Pathology, Therapeutics, Pharmacy, Toxicology & Hygiene. Edited by J. L. W. THUDICHUM, M.D. 2 vols. 8vo. *14s.* each.

A Dictionary of Chemistry and the Allied Branches of other Sciences. Edited by HENRY WATTS, F.R.S. 9 vols. medium 8vo. *£15. 2s. 6d.*

Inorganic Chemistry, Theoretical and Practical; an Elementary Text-Book. By W. JAGO, F.C.S. Third Edition, revised, with 37 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. *2s.*

Health in the House; Lectures on Elementary Physiology in its Application to the Daily Wants of Man and Animals. By Mrs. BUCKTON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, *2s.*

The FINE ARTS and ILLUSTRATED EDITIONS.

The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Illustrated with Engravings on Wood after Paintings by the Early Masters chiefly of the Italian School. New Edition in course of publication in 18 Monthly Parts, *1s.* each. 4to.

A Popular Introduction to the History of Greek and Roman Sculpture, designed to Promote the Knowledge and Appreciation of the Remains of Ancient Art. By WALTER C. PERRY. With 268 Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. *31s. 6d.*

Japan; its Architecture, Art, and Art-Manufactures. By CHRISTOPHER DRESSER, Ph.D. F.L.S. &c. With 202 Graphic Illustrations engraved on Wood for the most part by Native Artists in Japan, the rest by G. Pearson, after Photographs and Drawings made on the spot. Square crown 8vo. *31s. 6d.*

Lord Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome. With Ninety Illustrations engraved on Wood from Drawings by G. Scharf. Fcp. 4to. *21s.*

Lord Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, with Ivry and the Armada. With 41 Wood Engravings by G. Pearson from Original Drawings by J. R. Weguelin. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

The Three Cathedrals dedicated to St. Paul in London. By W. LONGMAN, F.S.A. With Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. *21s.*

Moore's Lalla Rookh, TENNIEL'S Edition, with 68 Woodcut Illustrations. Crown 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

Moore's Irish Melodies, MACLISE'S Edition, with 161 Steel Plates. Super-royal 8vo. *21s.*

Lectures on Harmony, delivered at the Royal Institution. By G. A. MACFARREN. 8vo. 12*s.*

Jameson's Legends of the Saints and Martyrs. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 31*s.* 6*d.*

Jameson's Legends of the Madonna, the Virgin Mary as represented in Sacred and Legendary Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 21*s.*

Jameson's Legends of the Monastic Orders. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 21*s.*

Jameson's History of the Saviour, His Types and Precursors. Completed by Lady EASTLAKE. With 13 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 42*s.*

Art-Instruction in England. By F. E. HULME, F.L.S. F.S.A. Fcp. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The USEFUL ARTS, MANUFACTURES, &c.

The Elements of Mechanism. By T. M. GOODEVE, M.A. Barrister-at-Law. New Edition, rewritten and enlarged, with 342 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Railways and Locomotives; a Series of Lectures delivered at the School of Military Engineering, Chatham. *Railways,* by J. W. BARRY, M. Inst. C.E. *Locomotives,* by Sir F. J. BRAMWELL, F.R.S. M. Inst. C.E. With 228 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21*s.*

Gwilt's Encyclopædia of Architecture, with above 1,600 Woodcuts. Revised and extended by W. PAPWORTH. 8vo. 52*s.* 6*d.*

Lathes and Turning, Simple, Mechanical, and Ornamental. By W. H. NORTHCOTT. Second Edition, with 338 Illustrations. 8vo. 18*s.*

Industrial Chemistry; a Manual for Manufacturers and for Colleges or Technical Schools; a Translation of PAYEN'S *Précis de Chimie Industrielle.* Edited by B. H. PAUL. With 698 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. 42*s.*

The British Navy: its Strength, Resources, and Administration. By Sir T. BRASSEY, K.C.B. M.P. M.A. In 6 vols. 8vo. with numerous Illustrations. VOL. I. 10*s.* 6*d.* VOLS. II. & III. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

A Treatise on Mills and Millwork. By the late Sir W. FAIRBAIRN, Bart. C.E. Fourth Edition, with 18 Plates and 333 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo. 25*s.*

Useful Information for Engineers. By the late Sir W. FAIRBAIRN, Bart. C.E. With many Plates and Woodcuts. 3 vols. crown 8vo. 31*s.* 6*d.*

Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, Upholstery, and other Details. By C. L. EASTLAKE. Fourth Edition, with 100 Illustrations. Square crown 8vo. 14*s.*

Handbook of Practical Telegraphy. By R. S. CULLEY, Memb. Inst. C.E. Seventh Edition. Plates & Woodcuts. 8vo. 16*s.*

The Marine Steam Engine. A Treatise for the use of Engineering Students and Officers of the Royal Navy. By RICHARD SENNETT, Chief Engineer, Royal Navy. With numerous Illustrations and Diagrams. 8vo. 21*s.*

A Treatise on the Steam Engine, in its various applications to Mines, Mills, Steam Navigation, Railways and Agriculture. By J. BOURNE, C.E. With Portrait, 37 Plates, and 546 Woodcuts. 4to. 42*s.*

Bourne's Catechism of the Steam Engine, in its various Applications. Fcp. 8vo. Woodcuts, 6*s.*

Bourne's Recent Improvements in the Steam Engine. Fcp. 8vo. Woodcuts, 6*s.*

Bourne's Handbook of the Steam Engine, a Key to the Author's Catechism of the Steam Engine. Fcp. 8vo. Woodcuts, 9*s.*

Bourne's Examples of Steam and Gas Engines of the most recent Approved Types as employed in Mines, Factories, Steam Navigation, Railways and Agriculture. With 54 Plates & 356 Woodcuts. 4to. 70*s.*

Ure's Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures, and Mines. Seventh Edition, re-written and enlarged by R. HUNT, F.R.S. With 2,604 Woodcuts. 4 vols. medium 8vo. £7. 7*s.*

Kerl's Practical Treatise on Metallurgy. Adapted from the last German Edition by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. &c. and E. RÖHRIG, Ph.D. 3 vols. 8vo. with 625 Woodcuts, £4. 19*s.*

Cresy's Encyclopædia of Civil Engineering, Historical, Theoretical, and Practical. With above 3,000 Woodcuts, 8vo. 25*s.*

Ville on Artificial Manures, their Chemical Selection and Scientific Application to Agriculture. Translated and edited by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. With 31 Plates. 8vo. 21*s.*

Mitchell's Manual of Practical Assaying. Fifth Edition, revised, with the Recent Discoveries incorporated, by W. CROOKES, F.R.S. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, 31*s.* 6*d.*

The Art of Perfumery, and the Methods of Obtaining the Odours of Plants; with Instructions for the Manufacture of Perfumes &c. By G. W. S. PIESSE, Ph.D. F.C.S. Fourth Edition, with 96 Woodcuts. Square crown 8vo. 21*s.*

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Gardening; the Theory and Practice of Horticulture, Floriculture, Arboriculture & Landscape Gardening. With 1,000 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21*s.*

Loudon's Encyclopædia of Agriculture; the Laying-out, Improvement, and Management of Landed Property; the Cultivation and Economy of the Productions of Agriculture. With 1,100 Woodcuts. 8vo. 21*s.*

RELIGIOUS and MORAL WORKS.

An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, Critical, Exegetical, and Theological. By the Rev. S. DAVIDSON, D.D. LL.D. Revised Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

History of the Papacy During the Reformation. By M. CREIGHTON, M.A. VOL. I. the Great Schism—the Council of Constance, 1378–1418. VOL. II. the Council of Basel—the Papal Restoration, 1418–1464. 2 vols. 8vo. 32*s.*

A History of the Church of England; Pre-Reformation Period. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE. LL.D. 8vo. 15*s.*

Sketch of the History of the Church of England to the Revolution of 1688. By T. V. SHORT, D.D. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The English Church in the Eighteenth Century. By the Rev. C. J. ABBEY, and the Rev. J. H. OVERTON. 2 vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

An Exposition of the 39 Articles, Historical and Doctrinal. By E. H. BROWNE, D.D. Bishop of Winchester. Twelfth Edition. 8vo. 16*s.*

A Commentary on the 39 Articles, forming an Introduction to the Theology of the Church of England. By the Rev. T. P. BOULTBEE, LL.D. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Sermons preached mostly in the Chapel of Rugby School by the late T. ARNOLD, D.D. 6 vols. crown 8vo. 30*s.* or separately, 5*s.* each.

Historical Lectures on the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. 8vo. 12*s.*

The Eclipse of Faith; or a Visit to a Religious Sceptic. By HENRY ROGERS. Fcp. 8vo. 5*s.*

Defence of the Eclipse of Faith. By H. ROGERS. Fcp. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nature, the Utility of Religion, and Theism. Three Essays by JOHN STUART MILL. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D. 8vo. Galatians, 8*s.* 6*d.* Ephesians, 8*s.* 6*d.* Pastoral Epistles, 10*s.* 6*d.* Philippians, Colossians, & Philemon, 10*s.* 6*d.* Thessalonians, 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Life and Letters of St. Paul. By ALFRED DEWES, M.A. LL.D. D.D. Vicar of St. Augustine's Pendlebury. With 4 Maps. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Conybeare & Howson's Life and Epistles of St. Paul. Three Editions, copiously illustrated.

Library Edition, with all the Original Illustrations, Maps, Landscapes on Steel, Woodcuts, &c. 2 vols. 4to. 42*s.*

Intermediate Edition, with a Selection of Maps, Plates, and Woodcuts. 2 vols. square crown 8vo. 21*s.*

Student's Edition, revised and condensed, with 46 Illustrations and Maps. 1 vol. crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Smith's Voyage & Shipwreck of St. Paul; with Dissertations on the Life and Writings of St. Luke, and the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients. Fourth Edition, with numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Handbook to the Bible, or, Guide to the Study of the Holy Scriptures derived from Ancient Monuments and Modern Exploration. By F. R. CONDER, and Lieut. C. R. CONDER, R.E. Third Edition, Maps. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Bible Studies. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D. PART I. *The Prophecies of Balaam.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* PART II. *The Book of Jonah.* 8vo. price 10*s.* 6*d.*

Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament; with a New Translation. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D. Vol. I. Genesis, 8vo. 18*s.* or adapted for the General Reader, 12*s.* Vol. II. Exodus, 15*s.* or adapted for the General Reader, 12*s.* Vol. III. Leviticus, Part I. 15*s.* or adapted for the General Reader, 8*s.* Vol. IV. Leviticus, Part II. 15*s.* or adapted for the General Reader, 8*s.*

The Four Gospels in Greek, with Greek-English Lexicon. By JOHN T. WHITE, D.D. Oxon. Square 32mo. 5*s.*

Ewald's History of Israel. Translated from the German by J. E. CARPENTER, M.A. with Preface by R. MARTINEAU, M.A. 5 vols. 8vo. 63*s.*

Ewald's History of Christ and His Time. Translated from the German by J. F. SMITH. 8vo.
[*Nearly ready.*

Ewald's Antiquities of Israel. Translated from the German by H. S. SOLLY, M.A. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

The New Man and the Eternal Life; Notes on the Reiterated Amens of the Son of God. By A. JUKES. Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 6*s.*

The Types of Genesis, briefly considered as revealing the Development of Human Nature. By A. JUKES. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Second Death and the Restitution of all Things; with some Preliminary Remarks on the Nature and Inspiration of Holy Scripture By A. JUKES. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Supernatural Religion; an Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation. Complete Edition, thoroughly revised. 3 vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religions of India. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. Crown 8vo. price *7s. 6d.*

Introduction to the Science of Religion, Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution; with Notes and Illustrations on Vedic Literature, Polynesian Mythology, the Sacred Books of the East, &c. By F. MAX MÜLLER, M.A. Cr. 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

The Gospel for the Nineteenth Century. Fourth Edition. 8vo. price *10s. 6d.*

Christ our Ideal, an Argument from Analogy. By the same Author. 8vo. *8s. 6d.*

The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost; or, Reason and Revelation. By H. E. MANNING, D.D. Cardinal-Archbishop. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. *8s. 6d.*

Passing Thoughts on Religion. By Miss SEWELL. Fcp. 8vo. price *3s. 6d.*

Preparation for the Holy Communion; the Devotions chiefly from the works of Jeremy Taylor. By Miss SEWELL. 32mo. *3s.*

Private Devotions for Young Persons. Compiled by Miss SEWELL. 18mo. *2s.*

Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Entire Works; with Life by Bishop Heber. Revised and corrected by the Rev. C. P. EDEN. 10 vols. £5. *5s.*

The Psalms of David; a new Metrical English Translation of the Hebrew Psalter or Book of Praises. By WILLIAM DIGBY SEYMOUR, Q.C. LL.D. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

The Wife's Manual; or Prayers, Thoughts, and Songs on Several Occasions of a Matron's Life. By the late W. CALVERT, Minor Canon of St. Paul's. Printed and ornamented in the style of *Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book.* Crown 8vo. *6s.*

Hymns of Praise and Prayer. Corrected and edited by Rev. JOHN MARTINEAU, LL.D. Crown 8vo. *4s. 6d.* 32mo. *1s. 6d.*

Spiritual Songs for the Sundays and Holidays throughout the Year. By J. S. B. MONSELL, LL.D. Fcp. 8vo. *5s.* 18mo. *2s.*

Christ the Consoler; a Book of Comfort for the Sick. By ELLICE HOPKINS. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

Lyra Germanica; Hymns translated from the German by Miss C. WINKWORTH. Fcp. 8vo. *5s.*

Hours of Thought on Sacred Things; Two Volumes of Sermons. By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D. LL.D. 2 vols. crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.* each.

Endeavours after the Christian Life; Discourses By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D. LL.D. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

The Pentateuch & Book of Joshua Critically Examined. By J. W. COLENSO, D.D. Bishop of Natal. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

Elements of Morality, In Easy Lessons for Home and School Teaching. By Mrs. CHARLES BRAY. Crown 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

TRAVELS, VOYAGES, &c.

Three in Norway. By TWO OF THEM. With a Map and 59 Illustrations on Wood from Sketches by the Authors. Crown 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

Roumania, Past and Present. By JAMES SAMUELSON. With 2 Maps, 3 Autotype Plates & 31 Illustrations on Wood. 8vo. *16s.*

Sunshine and Storm in the East, or Cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople. By Lady BRASSEY. Cheaper Edition, with 2 Maps and 114 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Cr. 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

A Voyage in the 'Sunbeam,' our Home on the Ocean for Eleven Months. By Lady BRASSEY. Cheaper Edition, with Map and 65 Wood Engravings. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.* School Edition, fcp. *2s.* Popular Edition, 4to. *6d.*

Eight Years in Ceylon. By Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, M.A. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, *7s. 6d.*

The Rifle and the Hound in Ceylon. By Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, M.A. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, *7s. 6d.*

Sacred Palmlands; or, the Journal of a Spring Tour in Egypt and the Holy Land. By A. G. WELD. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

Wintering in the Riviera; with Notes of Travel in Italy and France, and Practical Hints to Travellers. By W. MILLER. With 12 Illustrations. Post 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

San Remo and the Western Riviera, climatically and medically considered. By A. HILL HASSALL, M.D. Map and Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

Himalayan and Sub-Himalayan Districts of British India, their Climate, Medical Topography, and Disease Distribution. By F. N. MACNAMARA, M.D. With Map and Fever Chart. 8vo. *21s.*

The Alpine Club Map of Switzerland, with parts of the Neighbouring Countries, on the scale of Four Miles to an Inch. Edited by R. C. NICHOLS, F.R.G.S. 4 Sheets in Portfolio, *42s.* coloured, or *34s.* uncoloured.

Enlarged Alpine Club Map of the Swiss and Italian Alps, on the Scale of 3 English Statute Miles to 1 Inch, in 8 Sheets, price *1s. 6d.* each.

The Alpine Guide. By JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. Post 8vo. with Maps and other Illustrations :—

The Eastern Alps, *10s. 6d.*

Central Alps, including all the Oberland District, *7s. 6d.*

Western Alps, including Mont Blanc, Monte Rosa, Zermatt, &c. Price *6s. 6d.*

On Alpine Travelling and the Geology of the Alps. Price *1s.* Either of the Three Volumes or Parts of the 'Alpine Guide' may be had with this Introduction prefixed, *1s.* extra.

WORKS of FICTION.

In Trust; the Story of a Lady and her Lover. By Mrs. OLIPHANT. Cabinet Edition. Cr. 8vo. *6s.*

The Hughenden Edition of the Novels and Tales of the Earl of Beaconsfield, K.G. from Vivian Grey to Endymion. With Maclise's Portrait of the Author, a later Portrait on Steel from a recent Photograph, and a Vignette to each volume. Eleven Volumes, cr. 8vo. *42s.*

Novels and Tales. By the Right Hon. the EARL of BEACONSFIELD, K.G. The Cabinet Edition. Eleven Volumes, crown 8vo. *6s.* each.

The Novels and Tales of the Right Hon. the Earl of Beaconsfield, K.G. Modern Novelist's Library Edition, complete in Eleven Volumes, crown 8vo. price *22s.* boards, or *27s. 6d.* cloth.

Novels and Tales by the Earl of Beaconsfield, K.G. Modern Novelist's Library Edition, complete in Eleven Volumes, crown 8vo. cloth extra, with gilt edges, price 33*s.*

Whispers from Fairyland. By Lord BRABOURNE. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Higgledy-Piggledy. By Lord BRABOURNE. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stories and Tales. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL. Cabinet Edition, in Ten Volumes, crown 8vo. price 3*s.* 6*d.* each, in cloth extra, with gilt edges:—

Amy Herbert.
Gertrude.
The Earl's Daughter.
The Experience of Life.
Cleve Hall.
Ivors.
Katharine Ashton.
Margaret Percival.
Laneton Parsonage.
Ursula.

The Modern Novelist's Library. Each work complete in itself, price 2*s.* boards, or 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth:—

By the Earl of BEACONSFIELD, K.G.

Endymion.
Lothair.
Coningsby.
Sybil.
Tancred.
Venetia.
Henrietta Temple.
Contarini Fleming, &c.
Alroy, Ixion, &c.
The Young Duke, &c.
Vivian Grey, &c.

By ANTHONY TROLLOPE.

Barchester Towers.
The Warden.

By Major WHYTE-MELVILLE.

Digby Grand.
General Bounce.
Kate Coventry.
The Gladiators.
Good for Nothing.
Holmby House.
The Interpreter.
Queen's Maries.

By the Author of 'The Rose Garden.'

Unawares.

By the Author of 'Mlle. Mori.'

The Atelier du Lys.
Mademoiselle Mori.

By Various Writers.

Atherston Priory.
The Burgomaster's Family.
Elsa and her Vulture.
The Six Sisters of the Valleys.

POETRY and THE DRAMA.

Poetical Works of Jean Ingelow. New Edition, reprinted, with Additional Matter, from the 23rd and 6th Editions of the two volumes respectively; with 2 Vignettes. 2 vols. fcp. 8vo. 12*s.*

Faust. From the German of GOETHE. By T. E. WEBB, LL.D. Reg. Prof. of Laws & Public Orator in the Univ. of Dublin. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Goethe's Faust. A New Translation, chiefly in Blank Verse; with a complete Introduction and copious Notes. By JAMES ADEY BIRDS, B.A. F.G.S. Large crown 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Goethe's Faust. The German Text, with an English Introduction and Notes for Students. By ALBERT M. SELSS, M.A. Ph.D. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

Lays of Ancient Rome; with Ivry and the Armada. By LORD MACAULAY.

CABINET EDITION, post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*
CHEAP EDITION, fcp. 8vo. 1*s.* sewed; 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth; 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth extra with gilt edges.

Lord Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, with Ivry and the Armada. With 41 Wood Engravings by G. Pearson from Original Drawings by J. R. Weguelin. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Festus, a Poem. By PHILIP JAMES BAILEY. 10th Edition, enlarged & revised. Crown 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Poems of Virgil translated into English Prose. By JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

The Iliad of Homer, Homometrically translated by C. B. CAYLEY. 8vo. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Bowdler's Family Shakspeare. Genuine Edition, in 1 vol. medium 8vo. large type, with 36 Woodcuts, 14*s.* or in 6 vols. fcp. 8vo. 21*s.*

The Æneid of Virgil. Translated into English Verse. By J. CONINGTON, M.A. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

Southey's Poetical Works, with the Author's last Corrections and Additions. Medium 8vo. with Portrait, 14*s.*

RURAL SPORTS, HORSE and CATTLE MANAGEMENT, &c.

William Howitt's Visits to Remarkable Places, Old Halls, Battle-Fields, Scenes illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. New Edition, with 80 Illustrations engraved on Wood. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Dixon's Rural Bird Life; Essays on Ornithology, with Instructions for Preserving Objects relating to that Science. With 44 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 5*s.*

A Book on Angling; or, Treatise on the Art of Fishing in every branch; including full Illustrated Lists of Salmon Flies. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. Post 8vo. Portrait and Plates, 15*s.*

Wilcocks's Sea-Fisherman: comprising the Chief Methods of Hook and Line Fishing, a glance at Nets, and remarks on Boats and Boating. Post 8vo. Woodcuts, 12*s.* 6*d.*

The Fly-Fisher's Entomology. By ALFRED RONALDS. With 20 Coloured Plates. 8vo. 14*s.*

The Dead Shot, or Sportsman's Complete Guide; a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, with Lessons in the Art of Shooting Game of All Kinds, and Wild-Fowl, also Pigeon-Shooting, and Dog-Breaking. By MARKSMAN. Fifth Edition, with 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Horses and Roads; or, How to Keep a Horse Sound on his Legs. By FREE-LANCE. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Horses and Riding. By GEORGE NEVILE, M.A. With 31 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

Horses and Stables. By Major-General Sir F. FITZWYGRAM, Bart. Second Edition, revised and enlarged; with 39 pages of Illustrations containing very numerous Figures. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Youatt on the Horse. Revised and enlarged by W. WATSON, M.R.C.V.S. 8vo. Woodcuts, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Youatt's Work on the Dog. Revised and enlarged. 8vo. Woodcuts, 6*s.*

The Dog in Health and Disease. By STONEHENGE. Third Edition, with 78 Wood Engravings. Square crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Greyhound. By STONEHENGE. Revised Edition, with 25 Portraits of Greyhounds, &c. Square crown 8vo. 15*s.*

A Treatise on the Diseases of the Ox; being a Manual of Bovine Pathology specially adapted for the use of Veterinary Practitioners and Students. By J. H. STEEL, M.R.C.V.S. F.Z.S. With 2 Plates and 116 Woodcuts. 8vo. 15*s.*

Stables and Stable Fittings. By W. MILES. Imp. 8vo. with 13 Plates, *15s.*

The Horse's Foot, and How to keep it Sound. By W. MILES. Imp. 8vo. Woodcuts, *12s. 6d.*

A Plain Treatise on Horse-shoeing. By W. MILES. Post 8vo. Woodcuts, *2s. 6d.*

Remarks on Horses' Teeth, addressed to Purchasers. By W. MILES. Post 8vo. *1s. 6d.*

WORKS of UTILITY and GENERAL INFORMATION.

Maunder's Biographical Treasury. Reconstructed with 1,700 additional Memoirs, by W. L. R. CATES. Fcp. 8vo. *6s.*

Maunder's Treasury of Natural History; or, Popular Dictionary of Zoology. Fcp. 8vo. with 900 Woodcuts, *6s.*

Maunder's Treasury of Geography, Physical, Historical, Descriptive, and Political. With 7 Maps and 16 Plates. Fcp. 8vo. *6s.*

Maunder's Historical Treasury; Outlines of Universal History, Separate Histories of all Nations. Revised by the Rev. Sir G. W. COX, Bart. M.A. Fcp. 8vo. *6s.*

Maunder's Treasury of Knowledge and Library of Reference; comprising an English Dictionary and Grammar, Universal Gazetteer, Classical Dictionary, Chronology, Law Dictionary, &c. Fcp. 8vo. *6s.*

Maunder's Scientific and Literary Treasury; a Popular Encyclopædia of Science, Literature, and Art. Fcp. 8vo. *6s.*

The Treasury of Botany, or Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom. Edited by J. LINDLEY, F.R.S. and T. MOORE, F.L.S. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. Two Parts, fcp. 8vo. *12s.*

The Treasury of Bible Knowledge; a Dictionary of the Books, Persons, Places, and Events, of which mention is made in Holy Scripture. By the Rev. J. AYRE, M.A. Maps, Plates and Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. *6s.*

Black's Practical Treatise on Brewing; with Formulæ for Public Brewers and Instructions for Private Families. 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

The Theory of the Modern Scientific Game of Whist. By W. POLE, F.R.S. Thirteenth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

The Correct Card; or, How to Play at Whist; a Whist Catechism. By Major A. CAMPBELL-WALKER, F.R.G.S. Fourth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

The Cabinet Lawyer; a Popular Digest of the Laws of England, Civil, Criminal, and Constitutional. Twenty-Fifth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. *9s.*

Chess Openings. By F.W. LONGMAN, Balliol College, Oxford. New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

Pewtner's Comprehensive Specifier; a Guide to the Practical Specification of every kind of Building-Artificer's Work. Edited by W. YOUNG. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

Cookery and Housekeeping; a Manual of Domestic Economy for Large and Small Families. By Mrs. HENRY REEVE. Third Edition, with 8 Coloured Plates and 37 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

Modern Cookery for Private Families, reduced to a System of Easy Practice in a Series of carefully-tested Receipts. By ELIZA ACTON. With upwards of 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. *4s. 6d.*

Food and Home Cookery. A Course of Instruction in Practical Cookery and Cleaning, for Children in Elementary Schools. By Mrs. BUCKTON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, *2s.*

A Dictionary of Medicine. Including General Pathology, General Therapeutics, Hygiene, and the Diseases peculiar to Women and Children. By Various Writers. Edited by R. QUAIN, M.D. F.R.S. &c. With 138 Woodcuts. Medium 8vo. *31s. 6d.* cloth, or *40s.* half-russia.

Bull's Hints to Mothers on the Management of their Health during the Period of Pregnancy and in the Lying-in Room. Fcp. 8vo. *1s. 6d.*

Bull on the Maternal Management of Children in Health and Disease. Fcp. 8vo. *1s. 6d.*

American Farming and Food. By FINLAY DUN. Crown 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

The Farm Valuer. By JOHN SCOTT. Crown 8vo. *5s.*

Rents and Purchases; or, the Valuation of Landed Property, Woods, Minerals, Buildings, &c. By JOHN SCOTT. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

Economic Studies. By the late WALTER BAGEHOT, M.A. Edited by R. H. HUTTON. 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

Health in the House; Lectures on Elementary Physiology in its Application to the Daily Wants of Man and Animals. By Mrs. BUCKTON. Crown 8vo. Woodcuts, *2s.*

Economics for Beginners By H. D. MACLEOD, M.A. Small crown 8vo. *2s. 6d.*

The Elements of Economics. By H. D. MACLEOD, M.A. In 2 vols. VOL. I. crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

The Elements of Banking. By H. D. MACLEOD, M.A. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. *5s.*

The Theory and Practice of Banking. By H. D. MACLEOD, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. *26s.*

The Patentee's Manual; a Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent, for the use of Patentees and Inventors. By J. JOHNSON and J. H. JOHNSON. Fourth Edition, enlarged. 8vo. price *10s. 6d.*

Willich's Popular Tables Arranged in a New Form, giving Information &c. equally adapted for the Office and the Library. 9th Edition, edited by M. MARRIOTT. Crown 8vo. *10s.*

INDEX.

Abbey & Overton's English Church History 14
Abney's Photography 10
Acton's Modern Cookery 20
Alpine Club Map of Switzerland 17
——— Guide (The) 17
Amos's Jurisprudence 5
——— Primer of the Constitution 5
——— 50 Years of English Constitution 5
Anderson's Strength of Materials 10
Armstrong's Organic Chemistry 10
Arnold's (Dr.) Lectures on Modern History 2
——— Miscellaneous Works 6
——— Sermons 15
——— (T.) English Literature 6
——— Poetry and Prose 6
Arnott's Elements of Physics 9
Atelier (The) du Lys 18
Atherstone Priory 18
Autumn Holidays of a Country Parson 7
Ayre's Treasury of Bible Knowledge 20

Bacon's Essays, by *Whately* 5
——— Life and Letters, by *Spedding* 5
——— Promus, edited by *Mrs. Pott* 5
——— Works 5
Bagehot's Biographical Studies 4
——— Economic Studies 21
——— Literary Studies 6
Bailey's Festus, a Poem 18
Bain's James Mill and J. S. Mill 4
——— Mental and Moral Science 6
——— on the Senses and Intellect 5
——— Emotions and Will 5
Baker's Two Works on Ceylon 17
Ball's Alpine Guides 17
Ball's Elements of Astronomy 10
Barry on Railway Appliances 10
——— & *Bramwell* on Railways, &c. 13
Bauerman's Mineralogy 10
Beaconsfield's (Lord) Novels and Tales 17 & 18
——— Speeches 1

Beaconsfield's (Lord) Wit and Wisdom..... 6
Becker's Charicles and Gallus..... 7
Beesly's Gracchi, Marius, and Sulla..... 3
Bingham's Bonaparte Marriages..... 4
Black's Treatise on Brewing..... 20
Blackley's German-English Dictionary..... 7
Bloxam & Huntington's Metals..... 10
Bolland and *Lang's* Aristotle's Politics..... 5
Boultbee on 39 Articles..... 14
———'s History of the English Church... 14
Bourne's Works on the Steam Engine...13 & 14
Bowdler's Family *Shakespeare*..... 19
Brabourne's Fairy-Land..... 18
——— Higgledy-Piggledy..... 18
Bramley-Moore's Six Sisters of the Valleys. 18
Bramston & Leroy's Historic Winchester. 2
Brande's Dict. of Science, Literature, & Art 11
Brassey's British Navy..... 13
——— Sunshine and Storm in the East. 17
——— Voyage in the 'Sunbeam'..... 17
Bray's Elements of Morality..... 16
Browne's Exposition of the 39 Articles..... 14
Browning's Modern England..... 3
Buckle's History of Civilisation..... 2
Buckton's Food and Home Cookery..... 21
——— Health in the House.....12 & 21
Bull's Hints to Mothers..... 21
—— Maternal Management of Children. 21
Burgomaster's Family (The)..... 18

Cabinet Lawyer..... 20
Calvert's Wife's Manual..... 16
Capes's Age of the Antonines..... 3
——— Early Roman Empire..... 3
Carlyle's Reminiscences..... 4
Cates's Biographical Dictionary..... 4
Cayley's Iliad of Homer..... 19
Changed Aspects of Unchanged Truths... 7
Chesney's Waterloo Campaign..... 2
Christ our Ideal..... 16
Church's Beginning of the Middle Ages... 3
Colenso's Pentateuch and Book of Joshua. 16
Commonplace Philosopher..... 7
Comte's Positive Polity..... 4
Conder's Handbook to the Bible..... 15
Conington's Translation of Virgil's Æneid 19
——— Prose Translation of Virgil's Poems..... 18
Contanseau's Two French Dictionaries... 7
Conybeare and *Howson's* St. Paul..... 15
Cotta on Rocks, by *Lawrence*..... 11
Counsel and Comfort from a City Pulpit... 7
Cox's (G. W.) Athenian Empire..... 3
——— Crusades..... 3
——— Greeks and Persians..... 3
Creighton's Age of Elizabeth..... 3
——— England a Continental Power 3
——— Papacy during the Reformation 14
——— Shilling History of England... 3
——— Tudors and the Reformation 3
Cresy's Encyclopædia of Civil Engineering 14
Critical Essays of a Country Parson..... 7
Culley's Handbook of Telegraphy..... 13
Curteis's Macedonian Empire..... 3

Davidson's New Testament..... 14
Dead Shot (The)..... 19
De Caisne and *Le Maout's* Botany..... 11
De Morgan's (Mrs.) Memoir of her Husband 4
De Tocqueville's Democracy in America... 4
Dewes's Life and Letters of St. Paul..... 15
Dixon's Rural Bird Life.....11 & 19
Doyle's English in America..... 1
Dresser's Arts of Japan..... 12
Dun's American Farming and Food..... 21

Eastlake's Hints on Household Taste..... 13
Edmonds's Elementary Botany..... 11
Ellicott's Scripture Commentaries..... 15
——— Lectures on Life of Christ..... 15
Elsa and her Vulture..... 18
Epochs of Ancient History..... 3
——— English History..... 3
——— Modern History..... 3
Evans's Bronze Implements..... 11
Ewald's Antiquities of Israel..... 15
——— Christ and His Times..... 1
——— History of Israel..... 15

Fairbairn's Information for Engineers..... 13
——— Mills and Millwork..... 13
Farrar's Language and Languages..... 7
Fitzwygram on Horses..... 19
Francis's Fishing Book..... 19
Freeman's Historical Geography..... 2
Froude's Cæsar..... 4
———English in Ireland..... 1
———History of England..... 1
———Short Studies..... 6
———Thomas Carlyle..... 4

Gairdner's Houses of Lancaster and York 3
Ganot's Elementary Physics..... 9
——— Natural Philosophy..... 9
Gardiner's Buckingham and Charles I.... 2
———Personal Government of Charles I. 2
———Fall of ditto..... 2
———Outline of English History... 2
———Puritan Resolution..... 3
———Thirty Years' War..... 3
———(Mrs.) French Revolution..... 3
——— Struggle against Absolute Monarchy..... 3
Glazebrook's Physical Optics..... 10
Goethe's Faust, by Birds..... 18
——— by Selss..... 18
——— by Webb..... 18
Goodeve's Mechanics..... 10
——— Mechanism..... 13
Gore's Electro-Metallurgy..... 10
Gospel (The) for the Nineteenth Century. 16
Grant's Ethics of Aristotle..... 5
Graver Thoughts of a Country Parson..... 7
Graves's Life of Sir W. Hamilton..... 4
Greville's Journal..... 1
Griffin's Algebra and Trigonometry..... 10
Grove on Correlation of Physical Forces... 9
Gwilt's Encyclopædia of Architecture..... 13

Hale's Fall of the Stuarts..... 3
Halliwell-Phillipps's Outlines of Shakespeare's Life..... 4
Hartwig's Works on Popular Natural History, &c.....10 & 11
Hassall's Climate of San Remo..... 17
Haughton's Physical Geography..... 10
Hayward's Selected Essays..... 6

Heer's Primeval World of Switzerland..... 11
Helmholtz's Scientific Lectures 9
Herschel's Outlines of Astronomy 8
Hopkins's Christ the Consoler 16
Horses and Roads 19
Howitt's Visits to Remarkable Places 19
Hullah's History of Modern Music 11
——— Transition Period 11
Hulme's Art-Instruction in England 13
Hume's Essays 6
——— Treatise on Human Nature..... 6

Ihne's Rome to its Capture by the Gauls... 3
——— History of Rome 2
Ingelow's Poems 18

Jago's Inorganic Chemistry 12
Jameson's Sacred and Legendary Art..... 12
Jenkin's Electricity and Magnetism..... 10
Jerrold's Life of Napoleon 1
Johnson's Normans in Europe 3
——— Patentee's Manual 21
Johnston's Geographical Dictionary..... 8
Jukes's New Man..... 15
——— Second Death 15
——— Types of Genesis 15

Kalisch's Bible Studies 15
——— Commentary on the Bible 15
——— Path and Goal..... 5
Keary's Outlines of Primitive Belief..... 6
Keller's Lake Dwellings of Switzerland.... 11
Kerl's Metallurgy, by *Crookes* and *Röhrig*. 14

Landscapes, Churches, &c..... 7
Latham's Handbook of English Language 7
Lecky's History of England..... 1
——— European Morals..... 2
——— Rationalism 2
——— Leaders of Public Opinion..... 4
Leisure Hours in Town 7
Leslie's Political and Moral Philosophy ... 6
Lessons of Middle Age 7
Lewes's History of Philosophy 2
Lewis on Authority 6
Liddell and *Scott's* Greek-English Lexicons 8
Lindley and *Moore's* Treasury of Botany ... 20
Lloyd's Magnetism 9
——— Wave-Theory of Light..... 9
Longman's (F. W.) Chess Openings..... 20
——— Frederic the Great..... 3
——— German Dictionary ... 7
——— (W.) Edward the Third..... 2
——— Lectures on History of England 2
——— St. Paul's Cathedral..... 12
Loudon's Encyclopædia of Agriculture ... 14
——— Gardening ...11 & 14
——— Plants..... 11
Lubbock's Origin of Civilisation 11
Ludlow's American War of Independence 3
Lyra Germanica 16

Macalister's Vertebrate Animals 10
Macaulay's (Lord) Essays 1
——— History of England ... 1
——— Lays, Illus. Edits....12 & 18
——— Cheap Edition... 18
Macaulay's (Lord) Life and Letters..... 4
——— Miscellaneous Writings 6
——— Speeches 6
——— Works 1
——— Writings, Selections from 6
MacCullagh's Tracts 9
McCarthy's Epoch of Reform 3
McCulloch's Dictionary of Commerce 8
Macfarren on Musical Harmony 13
Macleod's Economical Philosophy..... 5
——— Economics for Beginners 21
——— Elements of Banking..... 21
——— Elements of Economics..... 21
——— Theory and Practice of Banking 21
Macnamara's Himalayan Districts 17
Mademoiselle Mori 18
Mahaffy's Classical Greek Literature 2
Manning's Mission of the Holy Ghost ... 16
Marshman's Life of Havelock 4
Martineau's Christian Life..... 16
——— Hours of Thought..... 16
——— Hymns..... 16
Maunder's Popular Treasuries..... 20
Maxwell's Theory of Heat 10
May's History of Democracy..... 1
——— History of England 1
Melville's (Whyte) Novels and Tales 18
Mendelssohn's Letters 4
Merivale's Fall of the Roman Republic ... 2
——— General History of Rome 2
——— Roman Triumvirates..... 3
——— Romans under the Empire 2
Merrifield's Arithmetic and Mensuration... 10
Miles on Horse's Foot and Horse Shoeing 19
——— on Horse's Teeth and Stables..... 19
Mill (J.) on the Mind 4
Mill's (J. S.) Autobiography 4
——— Dissertations & Discussions 5
——— Essays on Religion..... 15
——— Hamilton's Philosophy 5
——— Liberty 5
——— Political Economy 5
——— Representative Government 4
——— Subjection of Women..... 5
——— System of Logic 5
——— Unsettled Questions 5
——— Utilitarianism 5
Millard's Grammar of Elocution..... 7
Miller's Elements of Chemistry 12
——— Inorganic Chemistry .....10 & 12
——— Wintering in the Riviera..... 17
Milner's Country Pleasures 11
Mitchell's Manual of Assaying 14
Modern Novelist's Library..... 18
Monck's Logic 5
Monsell's Spiritual Songs..... 16
Moore's Irish Melodies, Illustrated Edition 12
——— Lalla Rookh, Illustrated Edition.. 12
Morris's Age of Anne..... 3
Mozley's Reminiscences of Oriel College... 3
Müller's Chips from a German Workshop. 7
——— Lectures on Religion 16
——— Lectures on India 7
——— Science of Language 7
——— Science of Religion 16
——— Selected Essays 7

Nelson on the Moon..... 8
Nevile's Horses and Riding 19

New Testament (The) Illustrated 12
Newman's Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ 3
Nicols's Puzzle of Life 11
Northcott's Lathes & Turning 13

Oliphant's In Trust 17
Orsi's Fifty Years' Recollections 4
Our Little Life, by A. K. H. B. 7
Overton's Life, &c. of *Law* 4
Owen's (R.) Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of Vertebrate Animals 10
——— Experimental Physiology ... 10
——— (J.) Evenings with the Skeptics ... 6

Perry's Greek and Roman Sculpture 12
Payen's Industrial Chemistry 13
Pewtner's Comprehensive Specifier 20
Piesse's Art of Perfumery 14
Pole's Game of Whist 20
Powell's Early England 3
Preece & *Sivewright's* Telegraphy 10
Present-Day Thoughts 7
Proctor's Astronomical Works ..... 8 & 9
——— Scientific Essays 11
Public Schools Atlases 8

Quain's Dictionary of Medicine 21

Rawlinson's Ancient Egypt 2
——— Sassanians 2
Recreations of a Country Parson 7
Reeve's Cookery and Housekeeping 20
Reynolds's Experimental Chemistry 12
Rich's Dictionary of Antiquities 7
Rivers's Orchard House 11
——— Rose Amateur's Guide 11
Rogers's Eclipse of Faith and its Defence 15
Roget's English Thesaurus 7
Ronalds' Fly-Fisher's Entomology 19
Rowley's Rise of the People 3
——— Settlement of the Constitution ... 3
Rutley's Study of Rocks 10

Samuelson's Roumania 16
Sandars's Justinian's Institutes 5
Sankey's Sparta and Thebes 3
Seaside Musings 7
Scott's Farm Valuer 21
——— Rents and Purchases 21
Seebohm's Oxford Reformers of 1498 2
——— Protestant Revolution 3
Sennett's Marine Steam Engine 13
Sewell's Passing Thoughts on Religion ... 16
——— Preparation for Communion 16
——— Private Devotions 16
——— Stories and Tales 18
Seymour's Hebrew Psalter 16
Shelley's Workshop Appliances 10
Short's Church History 14
Simcox's Classical Latin Literature 2
Smith's (*Sydney*) Wit and Wisdom 6
——— (Dr. R. A.) Air and Rain 8
——— (R. B.) Carthage & the Carthaginians 2
——— Rome and Carthage 3
——— (J.) Shipwreck of St. Paul 15

Southey's Poetical Works 19
——— & *Bowles's* Correspondence 4
Stanley's Familiar History of Birds 11
Steel on Diseases of the Ox 19
Stephen's Ecclesiastical Biography 4
Stonehenge, Dog and Greyhound 19
Stubbs's Early Plantagenets 3
Sunday Afternoons, by A. K. H. B. 7
Supernatural Religion 15
Swinburne's Picture Logic 5

Tancock's England during the Wars, 1765–1820 3
Taylor's History of India 2
——— Ancient and Modern History ... 3
——— (*Jeremy*) Works, edited by *Eden* 16
Text-Books of Science 10
Thomé's Botany 10
Thomson's Laws of Thought 6
Thorpe's Quantitative Analysis 10
Thorpe and *Muir's* Qualitative Analysis ... 10
Three in Norway 16
Thudichum's Annals of Chemical Medicine 12
Tilden's Chemical Philosophy 10
——— Practical Chemistry 12
Trench's Realities of Irish Life 6
Trevelyan's Life of Fox 1
Trollope's Warden and Barchester Towers 18
Twiss's Law of Nations in Time of War... 5
Tyndall's (Professor) Scientific Works... 9 & 10

Unawares 18
Unwin's Machine Design 10
Ure's Arts, Manufactures, and Mines 14

Ville on Artificial Manures 14

Walker on Whist 20
Walpole's History of England 1
Warburton's Edward the Third 3
Watson's Geometery 10
Watts's Dictionary of Chemistry 12
Webb's Celestial Objects 8
Weld's Sacred Palmlands 17
Wellington's Life, by *Gleig* 4
Whately's English Synonymes 7
——— Logic and Rhetoric 5
White's Four Gospels in Greek 15
——— and *Riddle's* Latin Dictionaries ... 8
Wilcocks's Sea-Fisherman 19
Williams's Aristotle's Ethics 5
Willich's Popular Tables 21
Wilson's Studies of Modern Mind 6
Wilt's Myths of Hellas, translated by *Younghusband* 3
Wood's Works on Natural History 10
Woodward's Geology 11

Yonge's English-Greek Lexicons 8
Youatt on the Dog and Horse 19

Zeller's Greek Philosophy 3

Spottiswoode & Co. Printers, New-street Square, London.

296
Ew14h
v.6

19266